

La soumission des chrétiens aux autorités en Rm 13,1-7. Validité des arguments pauliniens?

Que l'interprétation de Rm 13,1-7 ait été et reste très discutée, le nombre d'études publiées dans le passé et jusque tout récemment le montre à l'évidence. Le passage est d'autant plus surprenant que ses énoncés semblent ignorer les exactions des préposés aux impôts et aux taxes dans l'empire d'alors, exactions connues de tous et qui provoquaient des réactions fortes et récurrentes; comment Paul peut-il affirmer que ces représentants de l'autorité font leur travail avec justice et diligence? Inacceptable semble en outre la déclaration sur l'origine divine de l'autorité politique, parce que cette autorité vient aujourd'hui le plus souvent du peuple et que les gouvernants n'osent plus prétendre exercer un pouvoir de droit divin. Rm 13,1-7 ne ferait-il donc que refléter une situation particulière, désormais obsolète, et ne pourrait-il plus aider les croyants à se situer par rapport au politique?

I. Les interprétations du passage

Embarrassant par certains de ses énoncés, Rm 13,1-7 a été considéré par certains comme un ajout ou une interpolation postérieure⁽¹⁾. Mais comme cette unité a plusieurs mots en commun avec celles alentour⁽²⁾, et qu'elle est bien située en son contexte, l'hypothèse de l'interpolation ou de l'ajout est aujourd'hui pratiquement abandonnée. Certes, Rm 13,1 n'est pas grammaticalement rattaché à Rm 12,17-21 — il y a asyndète —, mais de Rm 12,17-21 à 13,1-7, deux motifs assurent la continuité, celui du bien à faire et celui du vivre en paix avec tous les hommes: ayant demandé aux croyants de vivre en paix avec tous (Rm 12,18), Paul fait implicitement de la soumission aux autorités politiques une application exemplaire du vivre-en-paix.

Que le passage soit de Paul ne rend pas son interprétation plus aisée. Pourquoi l'apôtre a-t-il donc tenu à demander aux croyants à se

⁽¹⁾ Sur cette hypothèse, voir R. JEWETT, *Romans* (Minneapolis, PA 2007) 782-784, qui opte lui-même pour l'authenticité.

⁽²⁾ En particulier les adjectifs ἀγαθός, (12,9.21; 13,3 [2x].4), καλός, (12,17) et κακός, (12,17 [2x].21; 13,4 [2x].10); mais aussi ἀγάπη/ἀγαπᾶν 12,9; 13,8-10; ὀργή 12,19; 13,4.5; ἀποδιδόναι 12,17; 13,7; ἐκδικέω / ἐκδικος 12,19; 13,4; προσκαρτερέω 12,12; 13,6; τιμή 12,10; 13,7; πάντων ἀνθρώπων / πᾶσιν 12,17.18; 13,7; τὰς ὀφειλάς / μηδὲν ὀφείλετε 13,7.8.

soumettre⁽³⁾ en conscience aux autorités politiques? De nombreuses propositions ont été faites, résumées dans le dernier commentaire en date, celui de R. Jewett, que je me contente de citer textuellement⁽⁴⁾:

The passage has been interpreted as a warning not to participate in Jewish zealotism, in revolutionary agitation, or, as seems even less likely, not to create unrest that would jeopardize “the already vulnerable situation of the beleaguered Jewish population in Rome⁽⁵⁾”. It has been seen as a warning against Christian enthusiasm that believed the requirement of a state was incommensurate with the new age, which hardly matches the details in the passage⁽⁶⁾. The quiet early years of the Nero regime are depicted as the background of this positive view of the state⁽⁷⁾, and Paul wished to avoid any gesture of disloyalty that might jeopardize the peaceful extension of the Christian mission⁽⁸⁾. According to the comprehensive survey by Vilho Riekkinen, investigations of the background of Paul’s view of the governing authorities have sifted biblical Hebrew, Hellenistic Jewish, Greco-Roman, and early Christian sources. Since no single tradition or source contains all of the material in 13:1-7, it appears that Paul has incorporated terminology and ideas from a variety of directions⁽⁹⁾. Only recently have scholars begun to view this passage in the light of the Roman civic cult⁽¹⁰⁾ which could be a step toward taking fuller account of the political and cultural context of Paul’s letter and its missional purpose⁽¹¹⁾.

Jewett lui-même pense que Paul n’a pas l’intention de fonder une éthique politique, et il interprète le passage rhétoriquement; selon lui, l’apôtre veut trouver dans la communauté romaine un appui pour son

(³) Le verbe ὑποτάσσεσθαι peut avoir un sens passif (“être soumis”) ou actif (“se soumettre”). Comme dans la plupart de ses occurrences chez Paul le contexte suppose une soumission volontaire, il vaut mieux le traduire en français par un réflexif.

(⁴) R. JEWETT, *Romans*, 785-786. Dans ce paragraphe, les appels de note et les études citées sont de l’auteur.

(⁵) N. ELLIOTT, “Romans 13:1-7 in the Context of Imperial Propaganda”, *Paul and Empire. Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (éd. R.A. HORSLEY) (Harrisburg, PA 1997) 196.

(⁶) E. KÄSEMANN, “Principles for the Interpretation of Romans 13”, *Id.*, *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia, PA 1979) 196-216.

(⁷) M. THEOBALD, *Römerbrief* (Stuttgart 1993) II, 88.

(⁸) K. HAACKER, “Der Römerbrief als Friedensmemorandum”, *NTS* 36 (1990) 25-41.

(⁹) V. RIEKKINEN, *Römer 13. Aufzeichnung und Weiterführung der exegetischen Diskussion* (AASF 23; 1980) 95.

(¹⁰) N. ELLIOTT, “Romans 13:1-7”, 184-204.

(¹¹) R. HEILIGENTHAL, “Strategien konformer Ethik im Neuen Testament am Beispiel von Röm 13.1-7”, *NTS* 29 (1983) 55-61.

voyage missionnaire en Espagne, voilà pourquoi il veut signifier que ce voyage ne provoquera ni rébellion, ni désordre, ni insoumission⁽¹²⁾. Mais Paul n'aurait-il pas été plus clair en disant tout simplement que lui-même voulait effectuer sa mission dans un esprit de paix avec tous et en particulier avec les autorités impériales et leurs représentants en Espagne? L'argumentation de Rm 13,1-7 est trop généralisante pour couvrir son seul projet missionnaire. Elle ressemble à bien d'autres passages où il est impossible de reconstruire l'arrière-fond historique concret sous-jacent — difficultés des communautés, situation de l'apôtre, etc. Je me suis déjà expliqué plusieurs fois⁽¹³⁾ sur cette technique paulinienne pour n'avoir pas à y revenir dans le détail, et je redirai seulement que la connaissance de l'arrière-fond historique n'est pas un préalable indispensable à la compréhension des lettres pauliniennes — et de Rm 13,1-7 en particulier. Voilà pourquoi nombreux sont ceux qui voient en ce passage une perspective plus ample, une réflexion sur le pouvoir politique, sa légitimité et sa fonction, car Rome n'est pas mentionnée, pas davantage l'empire romain, et le vocabulaire désignant les autorités est à ce point générique qu'il a été interprété de manière divergente⁽¹⁴⁾. À cet égard, le texte est lu de deux façons différentes⁽¹⁵⁾. Pour les uns, le passage viserait à déterminer les relations entre Église et pouvoir politique, et proposerait aux chrétiens d'entrer en politique. Pour les autres, la clef de lecture serait celle de l'obéissance, Paul invitant les chrétiens à se comporter en bons citoyens.

Il est vrai que l'apôtre n'exhorte pas à la loyauté, mais pas

⁽¹²⁾ R. JEWETT, *Romans*, 786,

⁽¹³⁾ Voir J.-N. ALETTI, recension de B. WINTER, *After Paul Left Corinth. The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, UK 2001), dans le "bulletin paulinien" *RSR* 2003, 288-291; Id., "La rhétorique paulinienne: construction et communication d'une pensée", *Paul, une théologie en construction* (éds. A. DETTWILER – J.D. KAESTLI – D. MARGUERAT) (Genève 2004) 52.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Autorités angéliques, juives, impériales ou plus généralement politiques. Voir en R. PENNA, "La dimensione politica dell'ethos cristiano secondo Rm 13,1-7 nel suo contesto", *Il potere politico: bisogno o rifiuto dell'autorità* (38a settimana biblica nazionale 2004), *Ricerche Storico-Bibliche* (2006) 183-210, les objections fondamentales contre les deux premières désignations. On supposera admis ici que les autorités dont parle Paul sont politiques.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Je m'inspire ici de la description faite par Oda WISCHMEYER, "Staat und Christen nach Römer 13,1-7. Ein neuer hermeneutischer Zugang", *Kirche und Volk Gottes* (FS J. Roloff) (éds. M. KARRER – W. KRAUS – O. MERK) (Neukirchener 2000) 150-152.

davantage à l'obéissance⁽¹⁶⁾, seulement à une soumission en conscience, de bon gré⁽¹⁷⁾. Chez Paul, en effet, la soumission, même volontaire, n'équivaut pas à l'obéissance; elle consiste à reconnaître et respecter un ou des statuts supérieurs, elle est l'attitude de l'inférieur, alors que l'obéissance décrit une adhésion totale de la volonté, sans d'abord considérer les statuts (celui de l'inférieur et celui du supérieur). Qu'il s'agisse de reconnaître le statut des autorités, l'argumentation le montre, qui insiste sur leur origine divine et leur fonction, elle aussi ordonnée à Dieu, puisqu'elles en sont les ministres.

La question rebondit malgré tout. Pourquoi Paul cherche-t-il à fonder théo-logiquement la légitimité des autorités politiques? Pour favoriser la soumission et, qui plus est, une soumission en conscience, puisque ces autorités font respecter la justice en récompensant le bien et en punissant le mal. La légitimation divine des autorités vise à justifier la soumission, le ὑποτάσσεσθαι, qui constitue l'exhortation première et principale du passage (v.1 et 5). Mais, que Paul insiste sur la soumission aux autorités politiques ne nous livre pas encore la clef d'interprétation du passage.

Le motif du bien à faire qui court tout au long de Rm 12–13⁽¹⁸⁾ ne fournit pas une clef d'interprétation plus sûre. S'il est vrai que Rm 13,1-7 doit être interprété en son contexte, comme le suggèrent O.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Quoi qu'en dise O. WISCHMEYER, "Staat und Christen", 155: "Nicht Loyalität, sondern Gehorsam war gefordert".

⁽¹⁷⁾ En ce passage, Paul n'oppose pas la soumission en conscience à la déloyauté, mais à la soumission *par peur*. L'appel à la συνείδησις ne signifie pas ici "la priorité de la conscience par rapport au principe de l'autorité", comme le déclare A. PITTA, "Rm 13:1-7: per un'etica politica cristiana", *Teologia ed etica politica* (éds. A. RODRÍGUEZ LUÑO – E. COLOM) (Roma 2005) 23, qui renvoie à 1 Co 8,7-12 et Rm 14,23, car Paul s'appuie sur le fait que l'autorité est d'origine divine et sa performance positive pour inviter les croyants à se soumettre *en conscience*. À propos du syntagme διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν (qu'on rencontre aussi en 1 Co 10,25.27), Jewett cite à ce propos Plutarque, *De sera numinis vindicta* 556.ab: ταῦθ' <εἰκός> ἐκάστου τῶν πονηρῶν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναπολεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ διαλογίζεσθαι, πῶς ἂν ἐκβάσῃ τῆς μνήμης τῶν ἀδικημάτων καὶ τὸ συνειδὸς ἐξ ἐαυτῆς ἐκβαλοῦσα καὶ ἰκαρὰ γενομένη βίον ἄλλον ἐξ ἀρχῆς βιώσειεν. Par cette racine (συν + εἰδησις) est décrite "a conscience-pang whose very presence is painful". Également, toujours selon JEWETT, *Romans*, 797, les mots de cette racine "refer to the spontaneous knowledge one has *with oneself* that a deed performed is bad; such painful knowledge should be avoided, which leads to the peculiar formulations in ancient literature about avoiding 'conscience' altogether, understood as the painful 'conscience-pang'".

⁽¹⁸⁾ Les récurrences du motif du bien en ces deux chapitres: Rm 12,2.9.17.21; 13,3.4. Voir aussi Rm 14,16.21; 15,2).

Wischmeyer, R. Penna et d'autres, et que Paul y revient régulièrement sur le bien à faire, ne peut-on alors lire Rm 13,1-7 comme une invitation à faire le bien pour bénéficier de la reconnaissance des autorités? Mais l'exhortation à faire le bien pour être récompensé ne ressemble en rien aux motivations habituelles de l'apôtre, qui demande aux croyants de ne pas chercher leur intérêt propre⁽¹⁹⁾ ni de vouloir un quelconque éloge de la part des hommes, sinon de Dieu seul⁽²⁰⁾. C'est pourtant parce qu'il estime que les autorités récompensent le bien (Rm 13,3) qu'il demande aux croyants de se soumettre en conscience. Paul se contredirait-il donc?

On peut éviter la difficulté en disant, par exemple, qu'en ce passage, "Paul ne parle pas en théologien spécifiquement chrétien"⁽²¹⁾, mais en citoyen romain⁽²²⁾, s'adressant à tous les hommes pour les inviter à faire ce qui est à leur portée⁽²³⁾. Citoyen romain, Paul l'est sans aucun doute. Mais (1) rien, dans le passage, ne laisse entendre que c'est comme tel qu'il s'adresse à la communauté de Rome, car — c'est une autre technique de l'apôtre — il évite toujours en ses argumentations d'utiliser un de ses privilèges pour exhorter ceux à qui il s'adresse, sinon pour dire qu'il y a renoncé⁽²⁴⁾. Cela aurait été au demeurant une très mauvaise idée d'exhorter en citoyen romain une communauté comportant un bon nombre d'immigrés et d'esclaves. (2) L'argumentation est essentiellement théo-logique — et non politique ou civique —, car seul le recours à Dieu peut justifier ce à quoi il exhorte.

Mais quelle valeur donner à une argumentation théo-logique? Une valeur universelle, répondra-t-on, puisque l'apôtre s'adresse à tous sans exception (παῖσα ψυχή, 13,1) et pas seulement ni premièrement aux chrétiens. Réciproquement, si l'argumentation vaut pour tous, *a fortiori* devrait-elle valoir pour les chrétiens. Certes, mais les argumentations les plus fortes, parce que s'adressant aux seuls chrétiens, sont

⁽¹⁹⁾ Voir par ex. 1 Co 10,24; Ph 2,4.

⁽²⁰⁾ Rm 2,29; 1 Co 1,31; 3,21; 4,5.

⁽²¹⁾ O. WISCHMEYER, "Staat und Christen", 160: "In 13,1-7 spricht Paulus nicht als spezifisch christlicher Theologe".

⁽²²⁾ O. WISCHMEYER, "Staat und Christen", 157 ("aus der Perspektive eines römischen Bürgers").

⁽²³⁾ O. WISCHMEYER, "Staat und Christen", 160 ("er spricht *alle Menschen auf das Vorfindliche an*"). Souligné dans le texte.

⁽²⁴⁾ Exemples types: 1 Co 9; 2 Co 11-12; Ph 3,2-14, trois exemples de *périautologie*, dont les règles anciennes sont bien connues. Cf. L. PERNOT, "Periautologia. Problèmes et méthodes de l'éloge de soi-même dans la tradition éthique et rhétorique gréco-romaine", *REG* 111 (1998) 101-124.

christologiques ou pneumatologiques: accueillez-vous comme le Christ vous a accueillis (Rm 15,7), ayez en vous les sentiments qui furent dans le Christ Jésus (Ph 2,5), etc. Si donc l'argumentation vaut ou devrait valoir pour tous les hommes, oblige-t-elle autant les chrétiens que celles fondées sur un spécifiquement chrétien?

Telles sont quelques unes des questions soulevées par nos devanciers. Nous allons les retrouver au cours de nos analyses. Mais celles auxquelles l'exégète se trouve d'abord confronté étant le plus souvent méthodologiques et décisives pour les résultats, c'est par elles que nous commencerons.

II. Clefs pour une interprétation

1. *Le texte en son contexte. L'extension de l'agapè*

L'une ou l'autre étude sur Rm 13,1-7 a très justement insisté sur la perspective à adopter pour éviter les contresens: "pour saisir le sens exact du passage paulinien étudié [Rm 13,1-7], il est absolument nécessaire de le situer dans son contexte argumentatif. J'en suis convaincu, l'impression que Rm 13,1-7 est un corps étranger vient en grande partie du manque d'attention donnée au cadre épistolaire auquel le passage appartient" (25). Comme nous l'avons déjà relevé, Rm 13,1-7 est effectivement bien inséré dans son contexte, et l'on peut noter le rapport entre deux motifs éthiques, celui, typiquement chrétien, de l'ἀγάπη (Rm 12,9 et 13,8-10) et celui, universel, commun au monde grec et latin d'alors, du bien à faire et du mal à éviter (Rm 12,9.17.21; 13,3.4) (26), motifs qui s'entrelacent et soulèvent des questions intéressantes. R. Penna propose de lire ainsi leur articulation en Rm 12-13:

- 12,1-2 = *propositio*, où la perspective eschatologique est implicite
- 12,3-8 les rapports à l'intérieur de la communauté (selon les dons reçus)
- 12,9-13,10 les rapports avec ceux du dehors
- 12,9-13 le motif de l'agapè
- 12,14-13,7 le motif du faire-le-bien et ne-pas-faire-le-mal
- 12,14-21 rapports avec tous les hommes
- 13,1-7 rapports avec les autorités
- 13,8-10 synthèse de l'ethos chrétien: l'agapè ne fait pas le mal.
- 13,11-14 perspective eschatologique explicite.

(25) R. PENNA, "Rm 13,1-7", 194.

(26) Observation de R. PENNA, "Rm 13,1-7", 195-203.

Avant de déterminer la progression de l'argumentation, examinons de plus près les relations des chrétiens *ad intra* et *ad extra*. Les premières sont repérables grâce (1) au pronom ἀλλήλους⁽²⁷⁾, et (2) au motif de l'humilité: considérer les autres comme plus méritants ou supérieurs, et se laisser attirer par ce qui est humble⁽²⁸⁾. Les vv.10 et 16 décrivent donc des relations *ad intra*⁽²⁹⁾. Sont-ils les seuls? Non, car les vv.9-13, forment une unité stylistique⁽³⁰⁾, et l'agir auquel Paul invite les croyants n'a pas comme destinataires ceux du dehors⁽³¹⁾. Les vv.9-13 et 16 sont ainsi des exhortations *ad intra*. Y en a-t-il d'autres? Si le v.15 est à cet égard ambivalent, au v.14 en revanche les persécuteurs doivent être des non chrétiens (juifs ou autres): Paul désigne ici

⁽²⁷⁾ Rm 12,10 [2x], 16; 13,8. Et dans la suite de Rm: 14,13.19; 15,7.14.16, où il s'agit manifestement de relations entre chrétiens.

⁽²⁸⁾ Que la ταπεινότης ou la ταπεινοφροσύνη décrivent des relations intra-ecclésiales, un relevé du vocabulaire dans les lettres pauliniennes et dans la littérature de l'époque le montre aisément. Voir par ex. 2 Co 10,1; 11,7; Ep 4,2; Ph 2,3.8; Col 3,12. Pour le parallèle entre Rm 12,16 et Ph 2,2-4, voir J. HERIBAN, *Retto φρονεῖν e κένωσις*, *Studio esegetico su Fil 2,1-5.6-11* (Roma 1983) 185, et J.N. ALETTI, *Paul. Épître aux Philippiens* (Paris 2005) 126 et 130. Dans la littérature grecque non biblique, le terme est rarement utilisé, et il l'est de manière péjorative, l'humilité étant l'attitude de ceux qui ne peuvent se montrer forts. Pour un emploi contemporain de Paul, voir Flavius Josèphe, *Bellum* 4.492-494; chez Plutarque, l'adjectif ταπεινόφρων a aussi une connotation négative (celui qui a des sentiments bas; *De Alexandri Magni fortuna* 336e.7; *De tranquillitate animi* 475e.6). Dans la LXX, on ne rencontre pas ταπεινοφροσύνη, mais l'adjectif ταπεινός (de basse condition, humble) est très utilisé, et désigne, en bon nombre de passages, ceux que Dieu veut exalter (alors qu'il renversera puissants et arrogants); de même, ταπεινόφρων, très rare, a un sens positif en Pr 29,23; 1 P 3,8. Alors que dans le monde d'alors la ταπεινοφροσύνη est l'attitude de ceux qui doivent se résigner à la faiblesse, Jésus déclara être ταπεινός de cœur (Mt 11,29), et s'humilia jusqu'à l'extrême (Ph 2,8).

⁽²⁹⁾ On ne saurait donc suivre ceux pour qui les relations avec ceux du dehors vont de 12,9 à 13,10.

⁽³⁰⁾ Les v. 9-13 commencent pas une phrase nominale (ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος) suivie de 10 participes et 2 adjectifs (10x dans l'ordre suivant: substantif [9x au datif et 1x à l'accusatif] précédé de l'article + participe/adjectif au nominatif pluriel) ayant manifestement pour fonction de développer et d'expliciter la phrase nominale initiale.

⁽³¹⁾ Le v. 13b, dernier élément de la série, fait exception et transition, puisqu'il mentionne la φιλονεξία, l'hospitalité, dont l'objet est l'étranger, comme son nom l'indique; mais ce dernier n'est pas d'abord un non croyant, bien plutôt un croyant venu d'une autre ville ou d'un autre lieu, et qui, selon la formulation de Paul, n'est pas *du dehors* (οἱ ἔξω — 1 Co 5,12-13; cf. 1 T 3,7 et Mc 4,11). Au v. 13a, il est au demeurant signalé que ce sont les saints — d'autres chrétiens — qui doivent être les destinataires de la sollicitude des croyants.

d'autant moins comme persécuteurs des chrétiens, des frères, que les exhortations suivantes (Rm 14,1–15,13) n'en disent mot. Quant aux vv. 17-21, ils traitent manifestement des rapports de la communauté avec ceux du dehors, en reprenant des motifs du Deutéronome et des Proverbes⁽³²⁾. On peut ainsi tracer ainsi la progression des relations en Rm 12,9-21:

- | | | |
|-----------|----------|---|
| <i>a</i> | v. 9-13 | entre chrétiens (se faire du bien les uns aux autres), |
| <i>b</i> | v. 14-15 | avec les persécuteurs (non chrétiens): bénir ne pas maudire (dire), |
| <i>a'</i> | v. 16 | entre chrétiens (humilité), |
| <i>b'</i> | v. 17-21 | paix avec tous, même avec ceux qui font du mal: ne pas rendre le mal (faire). |

De *b* à *b'*, la progression est assez évidente, en compréhension: du ne-pas-dire-de-mal au ne-pas-faire-de-mal, mais aussi en extension: des persécuteurs, dont le nombre n'est pas précisé, à tous les hommes; de *a* à *a'*, elle ne l'est pas moins: du faire-le-bien au se-faire-humble, ou, en changeant de catégories, du faire à l'être.

Rm 13,1-7 est en continuité thématique avec Rm 12,17-21, où les motifs principaux sont ceux du bien (καλά) et de la paix (εἰρηνεύειν) à promouvoir: en faisant le bien, les chrétiens seront d'autant plus en paix avec les autorités politiques que celles-ci récompensent le bien. La mention des ἐξουσίαι ajoute au demeurant un caractère officiel à la reconnaissance du bien opéré par les chrétiens et à leur désir de paix.

Si la relation de Rm 13,8-10 à cet ensemble 12,9–13,7 n'apparaît pas immédiatement, il faut néanmoins reconnaître que Paul a voulu relier ces versets aux précédents par une phrase de transition, puisque le motif des dettes à payer (ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς, 13,7) lui permet de faire rebondir paradoxalement⁽³³⁾ ses exhortations en 13,8: "N'ayez de dettes envers personne, sinon [celle de] vous aimer les uns les autres" (μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, 13,8). Mais comment ne pas voir alors que Paul revient au motif de l'agapè, au point que certains se sont demandé si Rm 12,9–13,10 ne forme pas une unité composée concentriquement⁽³⁴⁾:

⁽³²⁾ Dt 32,35 au v. 19; Pr 3,4 au v. 17b; Pr 25,21-22 au v. 20. Et déjà Pr 3,7 au v. 16.

⁽³³⁾ Paradoxe, car l'apôtre passe sans transition d'une affirmation (ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς, 13,7) à sa contraire (μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε, 13,8).

⁽³⁴⁾ Suggestion de J.V. PICCA, *Romanos 13,1-7, Un texto discutido: Prolegómenos para su interpretación* (Roma 1981) 180, qui part de Rm 12,3 et non de 12,9.

- a* 12,9-16 l'agapè (ecclésial)
- b* 12,17-21 rapport avec tous (monde)
- b'* 13,1-7 rapport avec l'autorité politique (monde)
- a'* 13,8-10 l'agapè (ecclésial).

On peut discuter cet ordonnancement. Il a au moins le mérite de soulever la question de ceux que Paul voit comme les destinataires de l'agapè. Si, comme cela a été montré plus haut, Rm 12,9–13,10 forme une séquence unifiée grâce à plusieurs motifs récurrents et à sa progression, et si l'agapè en constitue le point de départ et le point d'arrivée, cela signifie-t-il que la vie éthique des croyants est tout entière incluse ou comprise dans l'agapè, qui en serait le premier et le dernier mot? L'agapè ne serait plus alors seulement le moteur de l'agir entre chrétiens (Rm 12,9-13), mais aussi celui de leur rapport aux non chrétiens⁽³⁵⁾?

Si l'on examine la manière dont Paul utilise le substantif ἀγάπη et le verbe ἀγαπάω, on ne le voit jamais déclarer explicitement, à la différence du Jésus de Mt/Lc⁽³⁶⁾, qu'il faut aimer les non chrétiens, *a fortiori* les ennemis. Chez Paul, les destinataires de l'ἀγάπη sont les frères ou les saints⁽³⁷⁾. Rm 13,8 ne fait pas exception, puisque l'ἀγάπη y est réciproque (ἀλλήλους)⁽³⁸⁾ et a manifestement pour destinataires les frères. Comme Rm 13,8 et 10 se correspondent, on peut raisonnablement inférer que le prochain (ὁ πλησίον) du v. 10 doit être un membre de la communauté, un frère. Mais cette désignation est-elle exclusive? En énumérant les commandements de la Seconde Table de la Loi, Paul entend-il dire qu'ils ne valent que pour les frères en Christ, et qu'on peut tuer, voler, etc. "ceux du dehors"? Certainement pas, puisque, selon sa propre déclaration, il faut faire du bien même à ceux qui nous font du mal (12,20). Si les commandements énumérés concernent aussi "ceux du dehors", ces derniers ne sont-ils donc pas eux aussi notre prochain, et en leur faisant du bien (12,20), n'exerçons-nous pas la charité (12,9)? On peut raisonnablement conclure de ce bref survol qu'en Rm 12,9 à 13,10 l'agapè n'est pas seulement le

⁽³⁵⁾ C'est ainsi que le sous-titre de la BJ interprète Rm 12,14-21: "Charité envers tous les hommes, même les ennemis" et la note à Rm 13,9 (sur qui est le prochain).

⁽³⁶⁾ Mt 5,44 par. Lc 6,27.35.

⁽³⁷⁾ Outre Rm 13,8, voir Ga 5,13; 1 T 3,12; 4,9; 2 T 1,3 Phm 5; Col 1,4; Ep 1,15; 4,2. La remarque vaut pour les écrits johanniques: Jn 13,34.35; 15,12.17; 1 Jn 4,20.

⁽³⁸⁾ Ne pas oublier également qu'en ces versets Paul s'adresse aux chrétiens, en "vous".

premier et le dernier mot de l'éthique chrétienne, elle colore et oriente toutes les relations, même celles avec les non chrétiens. Mais si Paul pense cela, pourquoi n'est-il pas allé jusqu'à déclarer explicitement: aimez ceux qui vous poursuivent, aimez ceux qui vous font du mal? Cela peut venir de ce qu'il n'a pas eu connaissance du *logion* rapporté par Mt/Lc⁽³⁹⁾ et que, ne connaissant pas d'enseignement du Seigneur sur le sujet, il n'a pas osé de lui-même nommer ἀγάπη le bien fait à tous "ceux du dehors".

Revenons à la question des autorités: si Paul ne déclare pas qu'il faut les aimer, rendre ce qu'on leur doit (litt. les dettes) équivaut-il à ne pas les voler? Ne sont-elles pas alors notre prochain (Rm 13,9-10), et ne doit-on pas les aimer? Le vocabulaire choisi n'est pourtant pas celui de l'amour (ἀγαπᾶν), ni celui de l'obéissance (ὑπακούειν), mais de la soumission (ὑποτάσσεσθαι), du respect (φόβος), de l'honneur (τιμή), attitudes que doivent avoir des inférieurs pour ceux de statut supérieur, attitudes qui n'incluent pas nécessairement l'amour⁽⁴⁰⁾, ce dernier étant explicitement réservé en Rm 13,8 aux relations *ad intra*.

Les observations qui viennent d'être faites nous mènent au constat suivant: en Rm 12,9-13,10, Paul fait bien de l'agapè le moteur de l'agir chrétien, mais il n'utilise pas explicitement ce vocabulaire pour les relations *ad extra*, en particulier celles avec les autorités politiques. Pour en déterminer les raisons, une exégèse plus précise de Rm 13,1-7 est maintenant nécessaire.

2. Rm 13,1-7. L'argumentation et sa progression

Mettre en évidence la progression de l'argumentation de Rm 13,1-7 constitue un pas décisif dans l'interprétation d'un passage dont la finalité n'est pas évidente, comme en témoigne la diversité des titres donnés par les commentateurs⁽⁴¹⁾. Comme la plupart des exhortations

⁽³⁹⁾ À Mt 5,44 par. Lc 6,27.35, on peut ajouter la parabole dite du Bon Samaritain (Lc 10,29-37).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ En Ep 5,22-33, l'épouse doit se soumettre (ὑποτάσσεσθαι) à son époux, et celui-ci aimer (ἀγαπᾶν) son épouse. Les relations décrites ne sont pas équivalentes. Cela ne signifie évidemment pas que l'épouse soit dispensée d'aimer son époux (cf. Ep 4,2). Sur ce difficile passage, voir J.N. ALETTI, *Saint Paul. Épître aux Éphésiens* (Paris 2001) 272-291.

⁽⁴¹⁾ L'étiquetage peut être très neutre: rapport des chrétiens aux pouvoirs politiques (H. Schlier) ou à l'État et à la société (P. Stuhlmacher); les chrétiens dans la capitale de l'empire (K. Haacker); axiologiquement neutre, ce dernier chapeau est pourtant erroné, car Paul ne mentionne pas Rome, et les relations des chrétiens avec les autorités politiques, en particulier avec les préposés aux tribut et

de l'apôtre, celle-ci est composée de deux éléments: l'exhortation et sa (ou ses) justification(s). Ces deux éléments peuvent être répétés et combinés de différentes manières⁽⁴²⁾. En Rm 13,1-7, la différence entre exhortation et justification est aisément repérable, sauf en Rm 13,6, où *τελεῖτε* peut être un impératif ("payez") ou un indicatif ("vous payez"). Pour les v.1-5, la progression peut être ainsi décrite⁽⁴³⁾:

- v. 1a exhortation
- vv. 1b-4 deux justifications
 - une première renvoyant au statut de droit divin (instituées par Dieu) vv. 1b-2.
 - une deuxième, mentionnant un autre statut (serviteur) et une performance positive vv. 3-4.
- v. 5 reprise de l'exhortation.

De la première formulation de l'exhortation (v. 1a) à la deuxième (v.5), la progression est nette, puisque si, dans un premier temps, Paul demande la soumission, dans un deuxième, il demande une soumission volontaire, en conscience, parce que justifiée sur la prestation équitable des autorités politiques, comme le montre l'argument des vv. 3-4, plus long que le premier (vv. 1b-2):

aux différentes taxes, décrites en Rm 13,1-7, valent pour toutes les régions de l'empire. Le titre peut être plus orienté: obéissance aux représentants du pouvoir (O. Michel); vivez comme de bons citoyens (J.D.G. Dunn); première apologie chrétienne affirmant la loyauté envers l'État (E. Bammel); juguler la peur (A. Strobel); etc.

⁽⁴²⁾ Si *a* représente l'exhortation et *b* la justification, le schéma peut être minimal simple (*ab*), plus long: alterné (*aba'b'*), concentrique (*aba'*) ou chiasique (*abb'a'*), etc.

⁽⁴³⁾ La disposition suivante s'apparente à celle de H. MERKLEIN, "Sinn und Zweck von Röm 13,1-7. Zur semantischen und pragmatischen Struktur eines umstritten Textes", *Neues Testament und Ethik* (FS R. Schnackenburg) (éd. H. MERKLEIN) (Freiburg 1989) 243 (v. 1a: Grundsätzliche Forderung [soumission], suivie de deux argumentations: vv. 1b-2 et 3-4; v. 5: reprise de la requête). R. JEWETT, *Romans*, 784-785, regroupe aussi les vv. 1-5, mais distribue les arguments en fonction de leurs destinataires: v. 1a gnomie admonition (à la troisième personne du sg.); vv. 1b-3a = 1^{er} argument (général); vv. 3b-5 = 2^e argument: adressé à un interlocuteur imaginaire (à la deuxième personne du sg., en "tu"); vv. 6-7 = 3^e argument: adressé aux chrétiens de Rome (à la deuxième personne du pl., en "vous"). R.H. STEIN, "The Argument of Romans 13:1-7", *NT* 31 (1989) 325-343, fait aussi des vv. 1-5 l'argument principal, qu'il voit disposé de cette manière: A = v.1a general command; 1b-2 the first ground for the general command; B = 3a the second ground for the general command (with a positive [v. 3b-4a] and a negative [v. 4bcd] example; b' = 5a chiasmic summary of vv. 3-4 [wrath]; a' = 5b summary of 1b-2 [conscience].

Les magistrats ne sont en effet pas à craindre

(a) pour une œuvre bonne,

(b) mais pour [une œuvre] mauvaise.

(A) Veux-tu n'avoir pas à craindre l'autorité? Fais le bien et tu recevras d'elle un éloge;

car elle est servante de Dieu pour te conduire au bien.

(B) Mais si tu fais le mal, crains!

car ce n'est pas pour rien qu'elle porte le glaive,

car elle est servante de Dieu, exécutante de la colère contre qui fait le mal.

Si la progression des vv. 1-5 ne fait pas difficulté, la fonction des v. 6-7 n'est en revanche pas du tout évidente. Une seule chose est claire: Paul y intègre le paiement des taxes dans le principe général de la soumission, Mais ces vv. 6-7 constituent-ils la pointe du passage, ce vers quoi tout ce qui précède menait, s'il est vrai que le v. 7 est une exhortation finale, où la quadruple répétition ("à qui le tribut, le tribut; à qui la taxe, la taxe⁽⁴⁴⁾; à qui le respect, le respect; à qui l'honneur, l'honneur") indique une insistance⁽⁴⁵⁾? Un examen de ces versets nous le dira.

Le διὰ τοῦτο γάρ peut renvoyer au seul verset précédent (le devoir de se soumettre en conscience), ou plus probablement à toute l'argumentation des vv. 1-5 (le statut des autorités et la rétribution équitable qu'elles rendent). Mais le sens dépend surtout du mode, impératif ou indicatif, du τελεῖτε du v. 6a. Deux traductions sont ainsi possibles:

"à cause de cela en effet, *payez* (impératif) également les tributs"

"à cause de cela en effet, *vous payez* (indicatif) également les tributs"

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Le φόρος est le tribut payé non aux autorités juives (contre M.D. NANOS, *The Mystery of Romans. The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* [Minneapolis, MN 1996] 307-310), mais au pouvoir occupant (les Romains) par les peuples occupés, taxe directe perçue par les 'government officials'. Le τέλος est une taxe sur la terre, les maisons, des marchandises et produits variés, due par tous, même par les citoyens (*cives*) romains. S.R. LLEWELYN, "Tax Collection and the τελῶναι of the New Testament", *New Documents Illustrating Christianity* 8 (1998) 47-76, a relevé une centaine de taxes. T. COLEMAN, "Binding Obligations in Romans 13:7. A Semantic Field and Social Context", *TynB* 48 (1997) 307-327, divise les quatre syntagmes du v. 7 en deux groupes, les 'tangible' obligations (tribut et taxes) et les 'intangible' obligations (respect et honneur). Voir aussi R. MACMULLEN, "Tax-Pressure in the Roman Empire", *Latomus* 46 (1978) 737-754.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Noter également la montée rhétorique: de la soumission exprimée matériellement, par le paiement des taxes, le verset passe à la soumission volontaire, dont le dernier mot est l'honneur (τιμή), qui va plus loin que le simple ὑποτάσσεσθαι, car on peut se soumettre à quelqu'un sans pour autant lui rendre les honneurs!

Selon les bibles et les commentaires, le verbe est rendu par un impératif présent⁽⁴⁶⁾ ou par un indicatif présent⁽⁴⁷⁾. Comme le signale le dernier commentaire en date, celui de Jewett, l'ordre des mots ainsi que le γάρ favorisent l'indicatif. Schlier notait déjà que s'il s'agissait d'un impératif, on aurait la formulation suivante: διὰ τοῦτο τελεῖτε καὶ φόρους. En outre, l'impératif présent serait de type imperfectif et indiquerait plutôt la continuité: "continuez de payer les tributs" — mais rien dans le passage n'indique que les chrétiens de Rome voulaient cesser de payer le tribut. Pour ces raisons, l'indicatif présent semble plus sûr. La logique est alors la suivante: c'est parce que les autorités sont instituées par Dieu, agissent en vue du bien commun et rétribuent avec justice, que vous-mêmes payez les taxes; ce faisant, vous montrez que vous leur reconnaissez ce droit; en plus des taxes, rendez-leur aussi le respect et l'honneur que vous leur devez. De la quadruple répétition du v. 7, les deux premiers éléments renvoient au v.6a, et les deux derniers reprennent, pour la conclure, l'exhortation à la soumission, en utilisant deux substantifs affins, respect (φόβος) et honneur (τιμή):

v. 7bc = tribut, impôt → v. 6

v. 7de = respect, honneur → v. 1-5.

Les vv.6-7 sont composés des deux éléments précédemment mis en évidence, des justifications (v. 6ab) et une exhortation (v. 7); mais le v. 6 est tourné vers les vv. 1-5 et ne sert pas de preuve au v. 7, qui ne lui est pas rattaché syntaxiquement⁽⁴⁸⁾ et se présente comme une exhortation finale récapitulative. Les deux unités 7d et 7e indiquent en tout cas que la finalité du passage n'est pas d'inciter les chrétiens à payer des taxes qu'ils refuseraient de payer, mais bien plutôt d'insister sur le devoir de soumission, de respect et d'honneur envers les autorités politiques.

3. Les arguments, leur rôle et leur pertinence

Sans faire l'exégèse de toutes les données, il importe, à ce point de notre parcours, de nous interroger sur la valeur des preuves ou *pisteis* fournies par l'apôtre, puisque la valeur d'une argumentation dépend de celles de ses arguments.

Le premier argument fourni par Paul à l'exhortation initiale du v.1a ("que tous se soumettent aux autorités en charge"), de nature théo-

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Ainsi, la KJV, la CEI, San Paolo.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Entre autres, la RSV, la NRSV, la BJ, la TOB, Schlier, Fitzmyer, Jewett.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Noter l'asyndète.

logique, rappelons-le, se trouve en 1bc: “car il n’est pas d’autorité sinon par Dieu, et celles qui existent ont été établies par Dieu”⁽⁴⁹⁾. L’énoncé du v. 1b (οὐ [γὰρ] ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ) a la forme d’un principe, car c’est un *topos* bien connu et admis à l’époque, chez les juifs⁽⁵⁰⁾, les Romains⁽⁵¹⁾, le NT⁽⁵²⁾ et les premiers Pères⁽⁵³⁾. Son admission par tous, en particulier par les Écritures, en fait évidemment un argument incontestable dont l’énonciation se suffit à elle-même. Certes, Paul ne cite ni les Écritures ni les auteurs faisant autorité dans le monde d’alors, mais il n’a pas besoin de le faire, puisqu’il s’agit d’un principe admis par tous. En reconnaissant la légitimité divine des autorités politiques, l’apôtre ne se conforme donc pas seulement aux convictions d’une époque, il peut aussi implicitement se prévaloir de la parole divine consignée dans les Écritures, *auctoritas* pas excellence: si Dieu l’a voulu ainsi, il n’y a pas à discuter⁽⁵⁴⁾! Ajoutons que le principe énoncé ne consiste pas à tenir pour justes et droites toutes les décisions des pouvoirs politiques: une autorité peut être légitime et néanmoins mal utiliser le pouvoir que lui confère son statut.

Mais ce principe autrefois universellement admis ne l’est plus aujourd’hui, parce que la perspective s’est complètement inversée: les pouvoirs légitimes sont désormais ceux qui ont été élus ou désignés par le peuple et qui sont reconnus par le droit international. La légitimation divine est hors scène, et personne ne se risque à dire que les despotes sanguinaires tiennent de Dieu leur pouvoir. Cela ne signifie pas que le

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Selon K.W. PENG, *Hate the Evil, Hold Fast to the Good*. Structuring Romans 12.1–15.13 (London – New York 2006) 87-88, les vv. 1bc-2 formeraient un épichérème. Le “theological ground” au v.1bc (major premise v. 1b; minor premise v. 1c) et la conclusion au v. 2. L’épichérème est un syllogisme dans lequel la preuve d’une (ou de chacune) des prémisses se trouve dans la ou les prémisses elles-mêmes, et la conclusion déduite ou dérivée normalement.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Cf. 1 En 46,5; Si 17,17; Sg 6,1-3; lettre d’Aristée 219-224; 2 Bar 82,9; Philon, *De somniis* 78-92; Flavius Josèphe, *Bellum* 2.140.351. Le principe est déjà énoncé dans les Écritures: Is 45,1; Jr 25,7-11; 27,5-6; Dn 2,21.37; 4,17.22 (= 4,25 LXX); 5,21; Pr 8,15-16.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Sénèque, *De clementia* 1,2 qui cite la phrase de Néron: “N’ai-je pas été choisi parmi tous les mortels pour servir sur la terre comme vicaire des dieux?” (“Egone ex omnibus mortalibus placui electusque sum, qui in terris deorum vice funger?”); Dion de Pruse, *Orationes* 1.45; Pline le Jeune, *Panégérique de Trajan* 1.4-5.

⁽⁵²⁾ Outre Rm 13,1, voir Rm 9,17; Ac 25,8-11; Jn 19,11.

⁽⁵³⁾ 1 Clem 60,4–61,3; *Martyre de Polycarpe* 10.2.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Rhétoriquement, l’argument de Rm 13,1bc est *ex auctoritate*. Que la légitimation des autorités politiques s’appuie sur un tel argument n’est évidemment pas fortuit.

principe énoncé en Rm 13,1b ne contient pas quelque chose de vrai, à savoir que Dieu exerce sa patience même avec un pouvoir qui utilise la brutalité et le sang pour durer. Le changement de perspective dénote néanmoins un réel embarras, même chez les théologiens. Car un pouvoir, surtout s'il est politique, trouve aujourd'hui sa légitimité dans le bien commun et la justice qu'il promet, autrement dit: dans sa performance. Ce qui constitue précisément le deuxième argument de Paul, en Rm 13,3-4: les autorités politiques (1) sont instruments de Dieu pour récompenser le bien et punir le mal⁽⁵⁵⁾, et (2) exercent cette tâche avec justice.

L'argument de Rm 13,3-4 soulève deux difficultés. La première touche la cohérence du passage: en déclarant que l'autorité politique est ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργήν⁽⁵⁶⁾, Paul rend légitime pour les pouvoirs politiques le droit de vengeance qu'il a exclu pour les chrétiens dans la micro-unité précédente (Rm 12,17-19); mais on ne peut l'accuser d'illogisme, car, pour lui, Dieu seul peut se venger, et les autorités sont l'instrument qu'Il a institué pour punir les malfaiteurs. La deuxième difficulté est en revanche plus sérieuse. Pour valoir en effet, l'argument de Rm 13,3-4 doit être appuyé par les faits, autrement dit par un exercice de la justice rétributive globalement positif. Car Paul appelle les autorités chargées des taxes λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ. Pour les commentateurs, l'appellatif est pour le moins audacieux, car ceux qui étaient chargés de récolter les taxes prenaient un pourcentage notable et, pour ce faire, élevaient le taux de taxation⁽⁵⁷⁾. En en faisant des serviteurs du vrai Dieu, et diligents

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Au v. 4c, l'expression τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖν désigne ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler le *ius gladii*, au sens large de pouvoir de coercition et pas seulement de mis à mort.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Le syntagme est traduit de deux façons différentes, génériquement: "avenger for wrath", et spécifiquement et techniquement: "a legal officer for a court". À cause de Rm 12,19 (2x) et des autres passages pauliniens où le sens n'est pas technique (2 Co 7,11; 10,6; 1 T 4,6; 2 T 1,8), le sens générique convient mieux ici. Cf. R. JEWETT, *Romans, ad loc.*

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Coleman interprète le v. 7 à la lumière du contexte social de la période néronienne, durant laquelle les taxes augmentèrent beaucoup et des sanctions pénales furent créées afin de souligner le respect et l'honneur dû aux autorités impériales. Mais, pour ne pas mal interpréter l'argument de Paul, il ne faut pas oublier l'observation de J.E. LENDON, *Empire of Honor. The art of government in the Roman world* (Oxford 1997) 18: "To the emperor's subjects all their rulers together were 'the authorities' rather than 'the state'. They did not automatically see the connection between government's parts. It was possible to hate the tax-collectors and soldiers, as nearly everyone did, without hating the emperor, or even the governor". Autrement dit, la tendance était de "voir seulement les individus ou les positions, mais pas leur relation" (*ibid.*, 19).

(προσκορπεροῦντες) dans leur tâche, Paul ne se contente pas de reconnaître leur statut, il passe sous silence toutes les exactions qui avaient, à l'époque de Néron, soulevé des protestations répétées et fortes et son propos pourrait être compris comme un désir de couvrir la corruption existante. Il suffit de lire ce qu'en disent les historiens⁽⁵⁸⁾:

The system of farming out the collection of taxes to the highest bidder... was an open invitation to corruption. Once his bid had been accepted and he had contracted to pay the government the proffered lump sum, the first aim and overriding purpose of every tax-farmer was to show a profit in his enterprise... once the contract was safely in his pocket he did not hesitate to employ any and all means, illegal as well as legal, to maximize his profit by wrestling excessive and extortionate payments from his hapless and helpless victims. Such overhearing and violent behaviour was facilitated by the fact that collectors were frequently accompanied, ostensibly for their protection, by soldiers or armed guards, whom they could and did use to intimidate and maltreat the taxpayers.

Paul semble aussi ignorer les nombreuses fois où la conduite bonne et exemplaire des chrétiens ne fut pas reconnue comme telle. On sait par le livre des Actes que l'apôtre fut injustement incarcéré et maltraité⁽⁵⁹⁾; lui-même affirme avoir même été fouetté cinq fois par les autorités juives et trois fois par les romaines (2 Co 11,24-25). Il sait aussi que le Seigneur Jésus fut injustement condamné et mis à mort, mais, excepté en 1 Co 2,8, il n'en attribue pas la faute aux autorités politiques juives et romaines⁽⁶⁰⁾. Cette absence de critique pose question. Les historiens des débuts de l'ère chrétienne sont divisés sur le sujet. Selon certains, le jugement positif de Paul sur les autorités politiques vient de ce que, dans les années 55-60, les autorités impériales de la capitale et de l'endroit où fut écrite la lettre aux Romains œuvraient strictement selon les critères du bien et du mal. Selon d'autres, l'apôtre aurait été influencé par la propagande des premières années du règne de Néron⁽⁶¹⁾. Il aurait également appris que

⁽⁵⁸⁾ S.R. LLEWELYN, "Tax Collection", 68, qui cite N. LEWIS, *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford 1983) 160-161.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Cf. Ac 16,19-23.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Dans les lettres pauliniennes, la mort du Christ Jésus est due à l'initiative de Dieu, qui l'a livré, l'a fait péché, etc. pour nous montrer son amour (Rm 5,5-8; 8,31-32, etc.).

⁽⁶¹⁾ N. ELLIOTT, "Romans 13:1-7", 202-203. Voir les propos de Sénèque, *Epistulae* 114.7; *De clementia* 1.11.3. Comme on le sait, Sénèque fut précepteur de Néron. Si l'exécution des citoyens romains fut effectivement très réduite sous Néron, celle des esclaves et des étrangers ne le fut aucunement.

des chrétiens aisés et bienfaiteurs auraient été reconnus comme tels par les autorités politiques et le peuple⁽⁶²⁾. De son côté, Jewett propose la lecture suivante⁽⁶³⁾:

Yet the rhetorical force of Paul's argument was clear for the original audience: the Spanish mission will not encourage illegal subversion against the empire, because Paul accepts the doctrine that imperial officers are divinely appointed avengers for wrath against malefactors. This formulation would have been particularly well received by the two churches situated within the imperial bureaucracy. The missional motivation of Paul's discourse may be commendable, but one cannot say the same of his assessment of the evil potential of totalitarian regimes, including the Neronian government then in power.

Illusion sur le sadisme des autorités impériales, ou, au contraire, expérience de leur neutralité durant ses voyages missionnaires (sauf à Philippiques), ou, encore, nécessité, pour la communauté romaine, de ne pas se faire mal voir⁽⁶⁴⁾, ou, enfin, stratégie rhétorique pour obtenir l'appui des chrétiens appartenant à l'administration impériale en vue de son voyage en Espagne? Notons d'abord que si Paul avait mentionné les injustices faites aux chrétiens par les autorités politiques, il en aurait parlé comme en Rm 12,17-21, et aurait demandé aux chrétiens de ne pas se venger ou, plus probablement, de ne pas rendre le mal pour le mal. De plus, en s'acquittant de leur dû, en payant les différentes taxes, les chrétiens ne se montrent pas seulement pacifiques, citoyens bons et irréprochables dont les mérites seront un jour ou l'autre reconnus, mais ils se soumettent en réalité à la volonté divine. La répétition du mot *θεός* en ces deux versets n'est pas fortuite. Que l'autorité commette des injustices, n'infirme pas la relation de soumission des chrétiens à la volonté divine.

⁽⁶²⁾ Hypothèse de lecture de B.W. WINTER, "The Public Honouring of Christian Benefactors. Romans 13.3-4 and 1 Peter 2.14-15", *JSNT* 34 (1988) 87-103.

⁽⁶³⁾ R. JEWETT, *Romans*, 796.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Les historiens du christianisme primitif signalent à juste titre qu'à l'époque où Paul écrit Rm, la communauté romaine s'éloigne du judaïsme, avec, comme conséquence, la perte de la garantie de *religio licita* accordée à ce dernier et donc une nouvelle identité socio-religieuse sans protection. Voir par ex. Cf. A.M. RABELLO, "La situazione giuridica degli ebrei nell'impero romano", *Gli ebrei nell'impero romano* (éd. A. LEWIN) (Firenze 2001) 125-142, et l'article de R. PENNA, "La dimensione politica". Paul inviterait-il donc cette communauté à remplacer la taxe pour le Temple de Jérusalem par celles du gouvernement romain, afin de ne pas attirer l'ire et la répression de ce dernier? Mais le *τελειτε* serait alors un impératif, et cette lecture ne rend pas compte de la dynamique de l'argumentation.

Cela dit, en présentant les autorités politiques comme les instruments de la rétribution divine, l'argument pêche certainement par optimisme ou par excès. Telle est la raison pour laquelle Paul recourt à un troisième argument, à savoir l'attitude concrète des chrétiens qui, en payant le tribut — preuve que beaucoup sont des étrangers —, montrent concrètement qu'ils reconnaissent ces autorités, quelle qu'en soit la raison — peur de représailles, désir d'être reconnus pour fiables et bien intentionnés, etc. Pour la logique et la cohérence du passage, le τελείτε du v. 6 doit donc bien être rendu par un indicatif présent. Ainsi, ce que le deuxième argument a de potentiellement défaillant est compensé par le troisième: même si les autorités ne fonctionnent pas (toujours ou souvent) comme l'exigerait la justice rétributive divine, en payant les taxes, les chrétiens montrent qu'ils les reconnaissent effectivement et se soumettent à elles. Le v. 7 n'a plus alors qu'à leur demander de doubler cette reconnaissance matérielle d'une soumission de respect et d'honneur.

La soumission est donc bien le fil conducteur du passage. Mais la dynamique de l'argumentation montre que d'une soumission matérielle, par le paiement des diverses taxes, les chrétiens sont invités par Paul à montrer respect et honneur, bref, à faire que leur agir ne soit pas seulement extérieurement conforme aux décrets impériaux, mais διὰ τὴν συδείδῃσιν.

III. Reprise et conclusions

Rm 13,1-7 ayant donné lieu à de multiples interprétations, il a fallu assurer notre position méthodologiquement, en situant le passage en son contexte historique et littéraire, en décrivant sa dynamique, c'est-à-dire en déterminant surtout la fonction respective des arguments.

L'examen du contexte littéraire a montré que Rm 12,9–13,10 forme une séquence unifiée, où les exhortations de Paul visent alternativement les relations entre chrétiens (*ad intra*) et celles avec les non chrétiens (*ad extra*), et où l'agapè est (et devrait être) le moteur explicite (pour les relations entre chrétiens) et implicite (pour celles avec les non chrétiens) de l'agir chrétien.

Concernant les relations *ad extra*, Paul demande aux chrétiens de vivre en paix (εἰρηνεύειν Rm 12,18) avec tous les hommes, et nous avons vu que la soumission aux autorités politiques (Rm 13,1-7) fonctionne comme application exemplaire du vivre-en-paix. Ne mentionnant pas Rome, pas davantage l'empire romain et le voyage

missionnaire de Paul en Espagne, l'argumentation ne répond pas d'abord et seulement aux situations des chrétiens de Rome et de Paul. Les propos du passage visent l'universalité dans l'espace et le temps.

Mais les arguments fournis sont-ils contraignants? Obligent-ils autant que les arguments christologiques, typiquement chrétiens? Si l'argumentation de Rm 13,1-7 est théo-logique et non christologique ou pneumatologique — non directement chrétienne donc —, c'est parce qu'en ce passage l'apôtre pense que les motivations qu'il énonce valent pour tous, à l'aide d'arguments que les juifs et même les païens (avec l'ambiguïté du mot Dieu) admettaient. Ainsi s'explique l'absence d'arguments sur l'attitude ou sur les *logia* du Jésus de l'histoire — de même que Jésus ne prêcha pas la révolte, etc., de même vous aussi respectez les autorités —, ou encore sur le Ressuscité qui, tout en étant Seigneur de l'univers, laisse le cours de l'histoire aller à son terme. Des trois arguments fournis par le passage, le premier (Rm 13,1bc) suffisait alors à justifier la soumission, puisque c'était un *topos* universellement reconnu, même par les écrits bibliques. Si Paul en a ajouté un deuxième, plus fragile que le premier — ce qui, nous l'avons vu, l'a amené à formuler le troisième (Rm 13,6) —, c'est pour inviter ses correspondants à une soumission *en conscience*. Non qu'il demande aux chrétiens d'avalier et de bénir toutes les décisions des autorités, autrement dit d'être politiquement corrects⁽⁶⁵⁾, ou de se conduire en "bons citoyens" (*cives*) — ce qui aurait été un bel anachronisme, s'il est vrai que la communauté romaine était majoritairement composée d'étrangers et d'esclaves —, mais de montrer que le groupe chrétien, loin d'œuvrer à la dissolution sociale, veut faire advenir la concorde et la paix.

La visée de Rm 13,1-7 n'est ainsi ni d'élaborer une doctrine politique, ni de fonder la légitimité du pouvoir politique, ni de théoriser le rapport des croyants à l'État⁽⁶⁶⁾, ou encore de proposer aux chrétiens de prendre part activement à la vie politique. Elle est plus modeste mais non moins exigeante: donner à entendre que si les chrétiens sont effectivement dans le monde et l'histoire, la motivation de leur agir est

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Cf. O. WISCHMEYER, "Staat und Christen", 149, qui se demande: "Schreibt Paulus hier als Lehrer der Staatskonformität?", et répond opportunément par la négative.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Cf., par exemple, les études de J. TAUBES, J., *La Théologie politique de Paul*. Schmitt, Benjamin, Nietzsche et Freud (Paris 1999), et R. PANATTONI, *Appartenenza ed eschaton*. La lettera ai Romani di San Paolo e la questione 'teologico-politica' (Napoli 2001).

en définitive l'ἀγάπη et que cette dernière doit leur faire dépasser la peur, même et surtout devant des autorités politiques ayant pouvoir de vie et de mort. Car en Rm 12–13, nous l'avons vu, non seulement Paul fait de l'ἀγάπη le principe de l'agir chrétien pour les relations entre membres de l'Église (*ad intra*), mais il l'étend implicitement pour celles *ad extra*. En faisant de l'ἀγάπη le premier et le dernier mot de cette sous-section de Rm et en donnant à entendre que tous, les chrétiens et les autres, en sont les destinataires, Paul innove, tout simplement!

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 – Roma

Jean-Noël ALETTI

SUMMARY

Rm 13,1-7 has been interpreted in many different ways, often incompatible. This article is an attempt to show that this passage cannot be understood without its immediate context and also that its aim is neither to work out a political doctrine, nor to ground the legitimacy of political power; nor does Paul push Christians to influence political life, but he urges them to overcome a possible attitude of fear and implicitly to extend their *agape* to all human beings. In doing so he innovates.

“He Filled Zion with Justice and Righteousness” The Composition of Isaiah 33

Not surprisingly, in the Isaiah-research, chapter 33 is considered a key passage. If Isa 34-35 and 36-39 are disregarded — as they often are — as late insertions, Isa 33 becomes the closing section of the so-called First-Isaianic collection. In modern investigations on the formation of biblical books the outstanding literary significance of opening and closing chapters has never been debated. Isa 33 is commonly viewed as a redactional text, i.e. one composed for this specific location to function either as an editorial bridge between the first and the second part of the book⁽¹⁾, or — more often — as a concluding summary to Isa 1-32⁽²⁾.

At the same time, Isa 33 is a complicated text with intermittently shifting addressees, alternating time scale and different genres intersecting each other. In approaching this complexity, several exegetes assume that Isa 33 is composed of two (33,1-6; 33,7-24)⁽³⁾ or three (33,1-6; 33,7-16; 33,17-24)⁽⁴⁾ more or less independent compositions, brought together by a final editor. A few other scholars view the development of Isa 33 in terms of expansion of earlier

⁽¹⁾ W.A.M. BEUKEN, “Jesaja 33 als Spiegeltext im Jesajabuch”, *ETL* 67 (1991) 5-35. Cf. also U. BERGES, *Das Buch Jesaja*. Komposition und Endgestalt (Herders Biblische Studien 16; Freiburg 1998) 247-248.

⁽²⁾ E.-J. WASCHKE, “Jesaja 33 und seine redaktionelle Funktion im Protojesajabuch”, *Gott und Mensch im Dialog*. Festschrift für Otto Kaiser zum 80. Geburtstag (ed. M. WITTE) (BZAW 365.1; Berlin 2003) 529-532. E. BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1–39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch*. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit (OBO 154; Freiburg – Göttingen 1997) 186, and Z. KUSTÁR, “*Durch seine Wunden sind wir geheilt*”. Eine Untersuchung zur Metaphorik von Israels Krankheit und Heilung im Jesajabuch (BWANT 154; Stuttgart 2002) 86-87, 90, 93-94, believe that Isa 33 also forms a bridge to Isa 36–39.

⁽³⁾ G. FOHRER, *Das Buch Jesaja* (ZBK; Zürich – Stuttgart 1967) 135; R.E. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1–39* (Grand Rapids, MI 1980) 265.

⁽⁴⁾ J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique*. Isaïe, I-XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël (ÉB; Paris 1977–78) I, 429-438, and H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*. Kapitel 28-39 (BKAT X.3; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 1286, 1322, distinguish two lamentations, vv. 2-6 and 7-12(13-16) respectively, and a salvation prophecy, all from the same period.

material⁽⁵⁾. However, since these solutions were unable to explain all structural complexities most scholars renounced to reconstruct earlier forms of Isa 33 and chose to read it as one literary unit⁽⁶⁾, not excluding eventual minor additions or glosses⁽⁷⁾. In Gunkel's view, the shifting voices represent artificial creations of an author who makes use of liturgical patterns⁽⁸⁾. In more recent studies, the cause of the irregular construction is rarely dealt with explicitly, but it is apparently inferred that this can be explained within the limits of a complex literary coherence by the fact that Isa 33 is built as a text with frequent intertextual allusions to other parts of the book⁽⁹⁾.

The scope of this article is twofold. Firstly, it reopens the discussion concerning the literary integrity of Isa 33 suggesting a new diachronic model for the formation of this chapter. Secondly, it examines Isa 33 in comparison to other Isaianic texts, concluding with a brief note on its role in its current location.

I. The Coherence of Isaiah 33

Isaiah 33 begins as a ייחזק- prophecy. The ייחזק-particle also functions as a literary marker, as a catchword around which the speeches in the collection of Isa 28–33 were formed⁽¹⁰⁾. The extent of this collection is

(5) According to VERMEYLEN, *Isaïe*, I, 430, Isa 33,1-6 is composed of a genuine Isaianic v. 1, expanded in the late pre-exilic period by vv. 3-4, in the post exilic period by vv. 2.5-6a (with vv. 7-12, 17-24a), and even later by v. 6b (with vv. 13-16 and 24b). Vv. 7-16 are regarded as expansions of vv. 1-6 by K. KOENEN, *Heil den Gerechten – Unheil den Sündern. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Prophetenbücher* (BZAW 229; Berlin – New York 1994) 118. In the view of BERGES, *Jesaja*, 242, vv. 3-4.7-12 form an apocalyptic addition to Isa 33.

(6) B. STADE, "Miszellen. Jes. 32. 33.", ZAW 4 (1884) 254-271; J.J.M. ROBERTS, "Isaiah 33: An Isaianic Elaboration of the Zion Tradition", *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth. Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (eds. C. MEYER – M. O'CONNOR) (Philadelphia, PA 1983) 15-25; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 84-85.

(7) For v. 1, see B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen 1968) 240; v. 9: DUHM, *Jesaja*, 242 (also v. 8a); KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 83; BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen*, 184; vv. 21b.23: WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1312-1313; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 85; v. 23: DUHM, *Jesaja*, 247; vv. 23a.24: CLEMENTS, *Isaiah*, 272.

(8) H. GUNKEL, "Jesaja 33, eine prophetische Liturgie", ZAW 42 (1924) 177-208.

(9) See BEUKEN, "Jesaja 33", 5-35; BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen*, 185-188; WASCHKE, "Jesaja 33", 517-532.

(10) The six collections are: Isa 28,1-29; 29,1-14; 29,15-24; 30,1-33; 31,1-32,20; 33,1-24. Cf. G. STANSELL, "Isaiah 28-33: Blest Be the Tie that Binds

debated, and there is a tendency to exclude Isa 32–33 from this collection of *ḥē-*words. But were it not for the strange form and place of Isa 32, chapter 33 would certainly not appear as suspicious alongside Isa 28–31. In various other smaller and larger collections in Isaiah the pronouncements of judgment against Judah are closed by prophecies against its enemy (cf. Isa 10,5–11,9; 29,1–8; 30; 31). This observation makes it at least possible that the series of *ḥē-*prophecies against Israel and Judah (28–32) come to a close in Isa 33 with a text condemning the enemy through whom YHWH had punished his people. If this possible function of Isa 33 is taken into account, it leads to the first significant observation concerning the integrity of this chapter. From a literary critical point of view, the *ḥē-*prophecies in Isa 28–31(32) are usually composite structures. Can this also be the case with the apparently similarly formed Isa 33?

A second preliminary observation regards the form of Isa 33 as a *ḥē-*prophecy. If Isa 33 is compared to other *ḥē-*words, it strikes us that in other cases these *ḥē-*prophecies are much shorter in their alleged original form. Isa 33 would be not only the longest composition of its kind, but also the strangest one, with frequently interchanging topics and addressees (including YHWH in 33,2–3, which is unique)⁽¹⁾.

Beside these two external factors raising doubts concerning the coherence of Isa 33, the internal structure of this chapter also presents problems, as we shall see below. Regardless of integrity issues, the pericopes inside this chapter are delimited variously, with transitions signalised mostly between vv. 1 and 2, vv. 6 and 7, vv. 12 and 13 or 13 and 14, and vv. 16 and 17. In what follows, I turn to discussing these internal problems, paying special attention to these transitional verses.

Isa 33,1 gives the first concern of the prophecy: the subjugation of the enemy called *שׂוֹדֵד*, ‘destroyer’ and *בֹּגֵד*, ‘unfaithful’, ‘treacherous’. According to v. 1, the enemy is supposed to go down in a way it caused others to go down: the treacherous one will be deceived, the destroyer will be destroyed (*ius talionis*). Formally speaking, v. 1 is composed as a prediction, so that the fall of the enemy is still a matter of the future. It must bring destruction to completion first. V. 1 uses the 2nd and 3rd

(Isaiah Together)”, *New Visions of Isaiah* (eds. R.F. MELUGIN – M.A. SWEENEY) (JSOTSS 214; Sheffield 1996) 68–103.

⁽¹⁾ Cf. VERMEYLEN, *Isaie*, I, 430. See also WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1286: “ein Weheruf hat in einem Klagelied [as he interprets Isa 33,1–6] gewiß keinen Platz”. Nevertheless, he assumes that v. 1 represents the background against which the lament of 33,2–6 should be understood, and considers 33,1–6 one unit.

masc. forms in addressing the enemy and applies the paronomasia as a literary feature (יִבְקְרוּ / בָּקְרוּ / בִּקְרוּ / בִּקְרוּ; הוֹשִׁיעַ / שׁוּדָר / שׁוּדָר / שׁוּדָר).

In v. 2 the form and content changes abruptly. The יְהִי-cry of v. 1 is discontinued, both as a prophetic word and as a text addressing the enemy. Vv. 2-3 is a prayer of a community⁽¹²⁾ addressing YHWH in the 2nd person. Kaiser tried to solve the problem by maintaining that v. 1 was a superscription or motto to the main text⁽¹³⁾. But such a combination of woe-cry and prayer would be unique to the Bible. Wildberger, who is also aware of the unsuitability of v. 1, takes this as the description of the situation lamented in vv. 2-6⁽¹⁴⁾. However, v. 1 hardly complies formally with this element of the lamentations. Therefore the problem with the incompatibility of vv. 1 and 2-3 remains.

Although the prayer addressing YHWH in 2nd pers. comprises only vv. 2-3, scholars often connect v. 4 to this prayer⁽¹⁵⁾. In the present form of v. 4 this is clearly impossible because the 2nd pl. suffix of שָׁלַכְם points to a different speaker and audience⁽¹⁶⁾. Another problem is that while v. 3 probably alludes to historical experiences of deliverance, based upon which the community expects YHWH's future act of salvation⁽¹⁷⁾, the message of v. 4 is far too concrete to fulfil this function.

In my view, the problem is ultimately not with the text of v. 4, but with connecting it to vv. 2-3. As noted above, there is a break after v. 1, which may suggest that vv. 2-3, the unusual prayer in the context of a יְהִי-prophecy, were inserted here secondarily. If v. 4 is read as a direct follow-up to v. 1, the text becomes perfectly clear. The enemy was addressed in the 2nd and 3rd pers. in v. 1, and so we find this also in

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. זָרַעְנוּ / זָרַעְנוּ, קָיָינוּ, חָנְנוּ (cf. Tg, Syr and some Vg manuscripts). On the >נ change as scribal error, cf. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, MN – Assen 2001) 249.

⁽¹³⁾ O. KAISER, *Der Prophet Jesaja*. Kapitel 13–39 (Göttingen 1973) 269; cf. also KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 82.

⁽¹⁴⁾ WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1285.

⁽¹⁵⁾ BEUKEN, "Jesaja 33", 15; M.A. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1–39 with an Introduction to Prophetic Literature* (FOTL 14; Grand Rapids, MI 1996) 422; BERGES, *Jesaja*, 241; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 82.

⁽¹⁶⁾ In order to sustain the unity of vv. 3-4, שָׁלַכְם אֶת־כְּבוֹדִי (DUHM, *Jesaja*, 240; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1283) or שָׁלַכְם אֶת־כְּבוֹדִי (apparatus of the BHS³). However, there is strong support for the MT. Cf. 1QIsa^a, LXX (τὰ σκῦλα ὑμῶν), Vg (*spolia vestra*); note also the suff. in Syr (*bzhwn*). For the absence of the prep. כ in comparison, see GKC §§118r, 141d.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 82.

v. 4. Paronomasia is a significant literary device in v. 1, but also in v. 4 (אֶפְרַיִם / אֶפְרַיִם; כְּמִשֶׁק / שִׁקָּק). V. 4 predicts the reversal of fortunes for the destroyer⁽¹⁸⁾, as v. 1 did. The booty which the enemy had gathered will be given to its destroyers. As the enemy of Judah is pictured as a locust, so its destroyers also take on this appearance⁽¹⁹⁾.

To conclude, arguments derived from the content and literary form of vv. 1 and 4 suggest that these verses formed an earlier layer in the prophecy. The two verses were detached from each other, and a short prayer was inserted between them (vv. 2-3). The prayer, which also looks forward to the destruction of the enemy, apparently reflects on the text of the earlier יהוה-prophecy, and implores YHWH to fulfil the promise of deliverance that 33,1+4 predicted on a former occasion.

There is another shift in Isa 33,5. This verse speaks about God in the 3rd pers.: “YHWH is exalted for he dwells on high. He filled Zion with justice and righteousness”. Scholars usually connect this verse with the previous pericope, arguing that vv. 5-6 must represent the motif of confidence (*Vertrauensmotif*) of communal laments which Isa 33,1-6 supposedly imitates⁽²⁰⁾. The problem with this view is that v. 3 has already expressed the confidence of the praying community. The logical discontinuity between vv. 3, 4 and 5, questions that vv. 3-5 would have the same literary function.

As for the meaning of v. 5, the participles נִשְׁבַּח and שָׁכַן describe actions already evident to the author. The exaltation of YHWH is manifested in the circumstances⁽²¹⁾. That circumstance is the fulfilment of Zion with justice and righteousness. The word pair מִשְׁפָּט וְצִדְקָה has clear juridical connotations and is often mentioned in connection with the activity of the king as the representative of jurisdiction⁽²²⁾. This also corresponds well with the exaltation of

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. KAISER, *Jesaja*, 272.

⁽¹⁹⁾ See Jer 51,14; Nah 3,15-17. Cf. also Nah 2 with Joe 1-2. VERMEYLEN, *Isaïe*, I, 430, also argued that vv. 3-4 are secondary comments on v. 1, but his connection of vv. 3-4 and his independent derivation of v. 1 are problematic.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1286; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 82. VERMEYLEN, *Isaïe*, I, 430, considers vv. 5-6a the oracular answer to v. 2.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. J.A. ALEXANDER, *Commentary on Isaiah* (repr. Grand Rapids, MI 1992) II, 8; E.J. YOUNG, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, MI 1969) II, 408.

⁽²²⁾ 2 Sam 8,15; 1 Kgs 10,9; Ps 72,1; Isa 1,26 [cf. v. 25]; 9,6; Jer 22,15; 23,5; 33,15. In case it is used in a religious sense, this also means obedience to the law of God, often related to social justice (Gen 18,19; Deut 33,21; Ps 106,3; Isa 5,7; 28,17; 56,1; 58,2; Jer 22,3; Ezek 18,5.19).

YHWH in v. 5a (cf. Isa 6,1) ⁽²³⁾. It is therefore correct to render the qatal of מלא (with most scholars) as past tense ⁽²⁴⁾.

But what does it mean in v. 5b that YHWH filled Zion with justice and righteousness? This is generally interpreted as God's salvation of Jerusalem ⁽²⁵⁾. However, in that case contradiction arises with vv. 1-4, which speak about salvation yet to come. If Zion is saved already, why is there a prayer looking out for deliverance?

משפט and צדקה represent the divine order restored by YHWH (he is the subject of מלא): that is to say, punishing the godless and rehabilitating those oppressed. This means that the negative or positive connotation of משפט וצדקה is dependent on the attitude of the people towards YHWH. In Isaiah's descriptions of Judah in the 8th century, this word pair has negative connotations. There is no justice and righteousness in Jerusalem (Isa 1,21; 5,7; 28,17), that is, the people do not "fill" Jerusalem with justice and righteousness ⁽²⁶⁾. Justice and righteousness performed by YHWH means that Judah is punished for unlawful deeds (5,16; cf. 3,14; 4,4; 34,5). Somewhat similarly, משפט and צדקה in Isa 56-59 is used mostly in prophetic criticism or stipulations (56,1; 58,2; 59,8.14). The terms משפט and צדקה appear with positive connotations for Judah almost always in proclamations of the future ⁽²⁷⁾. The former city of lawlessness will become one of justice and righteousness (1,26.27; 32,16). This often means justice performed and supervised by the leaders (1,26-27; 9,6; cf. 11,4-5; 16,5; 28,6; 32,1). Second, in Isa 40-55, משפט and צדקה may refer to acts of salvation or rehabilitation (45,8; 46,13; 50,8; 51,5.6.8). But it is noteworthy that here the two terms are never used together (side by side or in parallelism) ⁽²⁸⁾. Third, in Isa 56-59, the attitude of the people is mirrored by YHWH's own משפט and צדקה, which may have the sense of bringing salvation (59,9.11). Yet this part of the book only speaks of the lack of manifestation of YHWH's משפט and צדקה.

⁽²³⁾ See also Ps 99,1 and 4; 103,6 and 19.

⁽²⁴⁾ E.g., ASV, NASB, JPS Tanakh, NRSV, Wildberger, Kustár. Taking it to refer to the present situation (NAB, Revidierte Elberfelder) is grammatically the least likely for the qatal form of מלא, cf. P. JOÜON – T. MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SubBi 14; Roma 1993) §112c-i. Rendering מלא as future (NIV, Einheitsübersetzung, Kaiser) is possible grammatically, and at a later stage in the composition of Isa 33 this may have also been implied (see below).

⁽²⁵⁾ YOUNG, *Isaiah*, II, 408; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1290; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 83.

⁽²⁶⁾ See also Isa 1,17.21; 5,23; 10,2; 29,21.

⁽²⁷⁾ Exception is 1,21, referring to the remote past in contrast with the present.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. R. RENDTORFF, "Zur Komposition des Buches Jesaja", *VT* 34 (1984) 312.

In the case of Isa 33,5b one should look for parallels in which משפט and צדקה are used together, with YHWH as performer. This leads to — for our case most illuminative — Isa 5,16: "YHWH of hosts will be exalted (גבה) in judgment (משפט) and the holy God will show himself holy in righteousness (צדקה)." It is strange that this verse is barely mentioned in connection with 33,5. Not only do both משפט and צדקה appear here, but they are used in connection with the exaltation of YHWH, as in 33,5. The exaltation of YHWH is connected to his judgment (and not salvation!) on Judah⁽²⁹⁾. When 33,5 maintains that YHWH filled Zion with justice and righteousness, it looks back to Isa 5,16 and considers 33,5 to be the fulfilment of this prediction: YHWH performed justice in Zion, who was punished for her sins. משפט וצדקה were re-established (cf. Isa 4,4).

This throws an interesting light on the relation of v. 5 with vv. 1+4. According to v. 1, as soon as the destroyer is ready with its work (כ[כ:] לתך / כהתמך)⁽³⁰⁾, it will be destroyed. V. 5 suggests that this time has now come. When Zion was filled with משפט וצדקה, divine punishment was brought to accomplishment. In his judgment, through this human tool (cf. Isa 10,5), YHWH manifested himself as an exalted powerful king (Isa 5,19). If this interpretation is correct, Isa 33,5 is part of a later elaboration on vv. 1+4.

Those who translate the qatal form of מלא in v. 5 as future rely on v. 6, with which this is seen as strongly related. Although 33,6 is extremely difficult to translate, it is most likely that יהיה alludes here to the future. The poetic structure of v. 6 may be represented as follows:

ויהי אמונת עתיד	and the steadfastness of your times will become (like)
חסן ישועת	a stronghold of salvation,
חכמה ודעת	wisdom and knowledge ⁽³¹⁾ , (i.e.)
יראת יהוה	the fear of YHWH,
הוא אוצרו	that will be his treasure house.

⁽²⁹⁾ YHWH's exaltation is also connected to judgment in 2,6-22, although neither צדקה nor משפט appear here. Isa 2,11,17 uses the same שגב niph'al as 33,5b (see below).

⁽³⁰⁾ כ is rendered as 'according to' by SWEENEY, *Isaiah*, 422. However, the temporal connotation of the verbs תחם and כ/נלה makes this unlikely. Sweeney's translation would require כשודך and כבגדך. For כ[כ:] לתך, see below.

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. JOÜON – MURAOKA, *Grammar*, §129s. חכמה ודעת appears to be a hendiadys for wisdom (Qoh 1,16; 2,26; Isa 47,10). According to wisdom traditions (Prov 1,7), יראת יהוה means חכמה.

Obviously, the literary parallelism is structured on the synonyms חֶסֶן, 'treasure, wealth, stronghold', and אוֹצָר, 'supplies, treasure(house), storeroom' ⁽³²⁾. In both lines of the parallelism the two synonyms form the predicate of the sentence, חֶסֶן וְהוּדָה... and הוּדָה אוֹצָר respectively ⁽³³⁾. But synonymous parallelism generally implies that other elements of the two verse lines also function similarly. On a syntactic level, חֶסֶן אֱמוּנַת עֲתִיד is said to become חֶסֶן, just as יְרֵאָה יְהוּדָה [...] will be אוֹצָר for Zion / Judah ⁽³⁴⁾. This note is important, for this makes it probable that the 2nd masc. suffix in עֲתִיד, does not refer to Judah, as usually understood, but to YHWH, as the parallel יְרֵאָה יְהוּדָה suggests.

אֱמוּנַת עֲתִיד, "the steadfastness of your (God's) times", may mean that God's time (permanence) is not affected by the course of history, in contrast to destroyers and treacherous ones who come and go. The destroyer is a temporary figure (cf. 33,1). A similar idea (God's permanence and the passing-away Chaldean oppressor) appears in Hab 1,12 ⁽³⁵⁾. חֶסֶן יְשׁוּעָה is "treasure of salvation", or perhaps better, "stronghold of salvation", or a "saving stronghold" ⁽³⁶⁾. As YHWH's אֱמוּנָה is Judah's חֶסֶן, so is יְרֵאָה יְהוּדָה its treasure room (אוֹצָר).

The form of this verse as addressing YHWH in the first instance (עֲתִיד), and referring to Judah in the 3rd pers. (אוֹצָר) makes it difficult to consider it as directly continuing v. 5. Yet in order to clarify its provenance and intention one has to analyse the entire prophecy first.

V. 7 is considered the beginning of a new unit, strophe or prophecy because of the discontinuity with v. 6. However, v. 7 is an unusual beginning for a new text. The logical discrepancy is caused by v. 6, which if removed for the moment, vv. 7-9 fit perfectly as a follow-up

⁽³²⁾ For the parallelism, see also Jer 20,5 and Isa 23,18 (verbs אוֹצָר and חֶסֶן).

⁽³³⁾ E. KÖNIG, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Gütersloh 1927) 286-287 and NRSV consider YHWH to be the implicit subject of וְהוּדָה, but that distorts the parallelism.

⁽³⁴⁾ The masc. וְהוּדָה before אֱמוּנַת is strange, but grammatically not impossible. It may be due to the masc. gender of the addressee (cf. the suffix of עֲתִיד). See וְהוּדָה in Job 8,7 (cf. Gen 10,10); Mic 5,6,7; cf. also וְהוּדָה with fem. nouns in Gen 35,5; 39,5; Ex 17,12 (cf. 1 Sam 5,9; 7,13; 12,5; 1 Chr 4,10); Josh 17,9; 19,1,33; 21,20; 1 Chr 6,21.

⁽³⁵⁾ The steadfastness of YHWH means that אֱתָהּ מִקֶּדֶם, "you are from everlasting" and לֹא תָמוּת, "you will not die" (pre-massoretic text), unlike the enemy, which emerges at one point in history and quickly passes away (Hab 1,6-11).

⁽³⁶⁾ In Ps 89,9 חֶסֶן and אֱמוּנָה are also related to YHWH. Cf. also Aramaic חֲסִינָא, 'fortification', 'stronghold' in KAI 202B:8. For YHWH as the stronghold of salvation, i.e. a powerful building, see 2 Sam 22,51, where he is the "tower of salvation", מִגְדֹּל יְשׁוּעָה, for the king. Similarly, in Ps 28,8 God is יְשׁוּעָה, "stronghold of salvation", for his anointed one.

to v. 5. Isa 33,7-9 concretises YHWH's actions in Jerusalem. He filled the city with justice and righteousness, i.e. performed his judgment in Zion. As a consequence, the warriors (אַרְאֵלִים)⁽³⁷⁾ cry aloud in the streets, the messengers of peace (מְלַאכֵי שְׁלוֹמִים) weep bitterly; the roads are empty, without travellers (cf. Jdg 5,6-7); people and nature are mourning⁽³⁸⁾.

The frequent opinion that Isa 33,8 refers to a foreign kings' disrespect of treaty obligations towards Judah is based first on v. 1, which proclaims judgment on the 'treacherous one' (בּוֹגֵד), a term which is used in connection with broken covenants⁽³⁹⁾. Second, scholars also interpret 33,8 through 2 Kgs 18,14-17⁽⁴⁰⁾. However, if v. 1 belongs to a different literary level, this clearly cannot influence the understanding of v. 8. As for the relationship with 2 Kgs 18, it is important that exactly the episode 18,14-16 is missing from the Isaianic parallel account of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah. Moreover, 2 Kgs knows nothing about a treaty broken by Assyria (cf. 2 Kgs 18,31 on the contrary), but 2 Kgs 18,7 does refer to Hezekiah's rebellion against Assyria.

It is therefore more likely that Isa 33,8 accounts the rejection of a treaty by the vassal Judah towards one of the foreign kings⁽⁴¹⁾. Ezek 17,12-18 speaks in the same manner about Judah breaking the treaty with Babylon (הַפָּר בְּרִיתָהּ). The covenant with the foreign king should have been kept as a covenant with YHWH (cf. Ezek 17,19; see also 2 Chr 36,13). When Judah rejected the treaty, the loyalty oath and disregarded the payment of tributes⁽⁴²⁾, he was punished by YHWH through a foreign nation.

⁽³⁷⁾ In spite of R. WEIS, "Angels, Altars and Angles of Vision: The Case of אַרְאֵלִים in Isaiah 33,7", *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of His 70th Birthday* (eds. G.J. NORTON – S. PISANO) (OBO 109; Freiburg – Göttingen 1991) 285-292, only this translation makes sense for אַרְאֵלִים (cf. אַרְאֵל in 2 Sam 23,20; 1 Chr 11,22). It is impossible to regard אַרְאֵלִים as a derivate from אַרְאָה ל, for אַרְאָה ל cannot be abbreviated to אַרְאֵלִים. Moreover, אַרְאָה ל (qal) means "to look after", "to care for" (Gen 22,8; Ps 64,6; 1 Sam 16,7), which is not suited here. אַרְאָה ל (niph'al), "I reveal myself", is also impossible. אַרְאָה ל hip'il is never used with אַרְאָה ל. For the idea of warriors crying loudly after an enemy incursion (שָׂדֶה), see also Isa 15,4 (רִעַנּוּ מִצִּי מוֹאָב הַלְצֵי מִלְחָמָה, "the armed men of Moab cry out").

⁽³⁸⁾ Isa 15,1-9; 19,1-15; 24,4-12; 32,12-13; Jer 12,4; 23,10; 50,35-38; Hos 4,2-3.

⁽³⁹⁾ Jdg 9,23; Hos 6,7; Mal 2,10-16. Cf. KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 82.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ KÖNIG, *Jesaja*, 291; FOHRER, *Jesaja*, 140; ROBERTS, "Isaiah 33", 21.

⁽⁴¹⁾ So also DUHM, *Jesaja*, 242.

⁽⁴²⁾ עֲדִידִים is most likely to be emended to עֲדִידִים, 'contracts' (not עֲדִידִים, 'witnesses') (cf. 1QIsa; HALOT; ROBERTS, "Isaiah 33", 19; cf. Aram. עֲד, 'treaty')

YHWH's judgment in Zion, the core of the lament⁽⁴³⁾, is followed by an oracular utterance in vv. 10-12. Vv. 10-12 and 5.7-9 belong to the same literary level. First, the dwelling of YHWH in the high (v. 5) and his arising to take action (v. 10) are also connected in Isa 18,4-5. Furthermore, the fact that this action is to take place immediately (עתה) suggests that we are again (as in v. 5) beyond the time scale of Isa 33,1, the completion of destruction. Finally, the 2nd pers. pl. in v. 11 is only understandable in the present context. Insofar as the prophecy is supposed to answer the events described in 33,5.7-9, it addresses the foreign nations proclaiming them destruction (cf. Isa 37,22-29). It is remarkable though that even this layer in the prophecy presupposes the existence of the enemy.

We may conclude thus far that Isa 33,5.7-12 is an elaboration on the earlier text 33,1.4. While in v. 1 YHWH's plan has not yet been accomplished, vv. 5.7-9 already presuppose that the enemy has fulfilled its task assigned to it by God. The prayer in vv. 2-3 is also secondary to 33,1.4. There are some clues that vv. 2-3 and 5.7-12 belong to the same literary level. These verses have the form of a communal lament evoked by the experienced calamities, as well as by the promise uttered in the earlier prophecy of 33,1.4 regarding the timely destruction of the enemy. The structure prayer of deliverance / description of the situation / oracular answer to the prayer is attested

and Akk. *adû / adiu*, '[treaty-]oath'). This is not only suggested by the parallelism with ברית (cf. also Gen 31,44), but also by the syntagmatic relationship with מאס, which is often used in connection with synonyms of עד (cf. Lev 26,15.43; 2 Kgs 17,15; Isa 5,24; Jer 6,19; Ezek 5,6; 20,13.16.24; 2,4). מאס appears with Jerusalem in 2 Kgs 23,27 (with YHWH as subject; cf. also Jer 14,19), but the pl. of ערים would sound strange in Isa 33,7. אנוש is probably a cognate of Ugaritic *'unt* and Akkadian *unuššu*, which means 'tax' or 'tribute' (cf. also 1 Kgs 10,15). Cf. D.R. HILLERS, "A Hebrew Cognate of *unuššu* / *'unt* in Isa 33, 8", *HTR* 64 (1971) 257-259; A.F. RAINEY, "Observations on Ugaritic Grammar", *UF* 3 (1971) 169; G. DEL OLMO LETE – J. SANMARTÍN, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica* (Aula Orientalis Supplementa 7; Barcelona 1996) I, 41-42.

If Isa 24,5 indeed alludes to 33,8 (W.A.M. BEUKEN, *Isaiah 28-39* [HCOT; Kampen 2000] 261-262; see note 95 below), this may again confirm that ברית has two further synonyms in 33,8.

Isa 33,8	Isa 24,5
הפר ברית	כיעברו תורת
מאס עדים*	חלפו חק
לא חשב אנוש	הפרו ברית עולם

⁽⁴³⁾ For vv. 7-9, cf. also H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *The Book Called Isaiah. Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford 1994) 223.

in Ps 12,1-6 and Isa 37⁽⁴⁴⁾. The role of v. 6 will be understood only later.

Isa 33,13 is a YHWH-speech that some see as one unit with 33,10-12⁽⁴⁵⁾. Other exegetes question that this formal similarity is sufficient to support literary unity⁽⁴⁶⁾. Indeed, the imperative שִׁמְעוּ often signifies the beginning of a new prophecy (cf. Isa 1,2,10; 6,9; 7,13; 36,13; 48,1; 49,1; etc.). Furthermore, the 2nd pers. forms in v. 13 do not refer to the enemy as in vv. 1, 4, or 11, but they have a different audience in view.

Regarding the connection between vv. 13-24 and 1-12, one may note that vv. 13-24 make often use of motifs attested in vv. 1-12, suggesting that the two are supposed to be related. At the same time, however, there is a clear shift in the theme of the prophecy from the promise of destroying the enemy, to the description of those going to dwell in the city in the future. At the point of v. 13, the enemy seems to have already been destroyed (cf. עֲשִׂיהִי). Moreover, while motifs and themes from vv. 1-12 reappear later, these motifs are reused in a modified sense, as reinterpretations, underlining their different origin. (a) אֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת in v. 14 points back to v. 12. But while fire is there an instrument of judgment, in v. 14 the fire is located in Zion and is identified with YHWH. (b) מִשְׁגֵּב and מְרוֹמִים in v. 16 clearly allude to v. 5, but while there the exaltation of YHWH emphasises his withdrawal and estrangement from Zion (cf. Isa 6,1; 18,4), in v. 16 YHWH and his people dwell in the same place. In v. 5 מְרוֹם is clearly not Jerusalem (Ps 148,1), but it probably is in v. 16. (c) In v. 15 הָלַךְ צְדָקָה may allude to צְדָקָה in v. 5, but in v. 5 it is a divine act. (d) In v. 8 the sinful ancestors rejected the treaty (מֵאֵס עֲדִים), in v. 15 the righteous one will reject (מֵאֵס) a form of life contrary to the covenant. (e) In v. 4 the identity of the plunderers of the enemy is unclear, in v. 23 these plunderers appear to be Jews.

Some take רְחוֹקִים and קְרוֹבִים to refer to non-Jews and Jews alike, i.e. all people of the world⁽⁴⁷⁾. Others consider קְרוֹבִים Jerusalemites and

⁽⁴⁴⁾ The description of the situation and the prayer are interchanged in Isa 37. Cf. also Ps 60; 85; Jer 14,1-10. The relationship between the prayer in 33,2-3 and the oracle 33,10-12 may also be underlined by רִיחַ in v. 10 and רִיחַמָּת in v. 3 (cf., however, 1QIsa^a).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ KAISER, *Jesaja*, 274; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1302; KOENEN, *Heil*, 119; SWEENEY, *Isaiah*, 424.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ VERMEYLEN, *Isaïe*, I, 432; ROBERTS, “Isaiah 33”, 15; WASCHKE, “Jesaja 33”, 520.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ KAISER, *Jesaja*, 274; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 84.

רחוק the dispersed Judaeans (Isa 43,6; 49,12; 60,4.9)⁽⁴⁸⁾. However, if v. 13 is related to vv. 14-16, it becomes clear that the author is concerned with Jews, not foreigners⁽⁴⁹⁾. Moreover, as we shall see below, vv. 14-16 also presuppose that the people addressed do not live in Zion yet, so that קרובים would unlikely refer to Jerusalemites over against those in the diaspora⁽⁵⁰⁾. Instead of a geographical connotation it is more probable that the merism of v. 13 signifies distance from God, the speaker: רחוקים refers to those who are far from him and קרובים those who are close to him, who trust him. A parallel example is Isa 57,19, which addresses both רחוק and קרוב, proclaiming them peace and salvation. The larger context of 57,19 suggests that רחוק and קרוב refer to the totality of the people of YHWH, with different degrees of knowledge and experience of him. רחוק symbolises the sinful and iniquitous people (57,17), for whom YHWH is the God, who dwells in a distant, high and holy place (57,15; cf. Isa 6,1; 33,5.15), those whom he must heal (57,18; cf. Isa 6,10; 33,24), and קרוב may allude to the contrite and those lowly in spirit (57,15), to whom YHWH says he is near (cf. also Jer 12,2; 23,23)⁽⁵¹⁾.

The scene in vv. 14-24 is imaginary and highly metaphorical. The question who may live in Zion (v. 14), the adverbs שם (v. 21) and אז (v. 23), the portrayal of the king and the "country far away" (v. 17), and the description of the city (vv. 20-21.23), all imply some distance in time and space from the real scene of events.

According to the context of vv. 14-15, חטאים and חסדים refer to exilic contemporaries of the author, so that these are in fact synonyms for רחוקים. These people have not yet succeeded to overcome and distance themselves from the negative spiritual heritage of their forefathers⁽⁵²⁾. If they would like to stay alive in Zion, they have to live according to

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf. Dan 9,7; CLEMENTS, *Isaiah*, 268; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 213.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Contra BERGES, *Jesaja*, 245.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ V. 14 does not presuppose that the sinners already live in Zion, but it rather emphasises that they cannot stay alive in Zion.

⁽⁵¹⁾ For Isa 57 as an allusion to Isa 33, cf. further the themes of dwelling on high (מרום...אשכנז; 57,15 | 33,5.16), the eternity of YHWH (שכן עד; cf. אמות עתיד in 33,6) and the healing of Zion punished for her sins (57,18-19 | 33,24). Seemingly the people distanced from God (רחוק) are distinguished from the רשעים in 57,20-21. In recent analysis, however, vv. 20-21 are regarded as additions (BERGES, *Jesaja*, 472-473; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 205; cf. KOENEN, *Heil*, 82). For רחוק and קרוב see also Isa 46,12 and 55,6-7.

⁽⁵²⁾ For חסדים, see Isa 1,4.18.28; 29,21; 31,7; 42,24; 43,27; 64,4. For חתך, see Isa 9,16; 10,6; 24,5; 32,6.

the Torah. Accordingly, קְרוֹבִים refers to the צַדִּיק. The list of v. 15 presents Zion faithful to the covenant, in contrast to Zion of v. 8⁽⁵³⁾.

V. 17 makes a transition from the impersonal formulations of vv. 15-16 to directly addressing Israel. As often noted, vv. 14-16 use the form of entrance-liturgies⁽⁵⁴⁾. This form is composed of a question (who may dwell close to God), an answer and a promise of blessing. This older liturgical form focusing on the pilgrims entering the temple is ingeniously readapted here to the situation of the Judean returnees. The final formula of these entrance-liturgies is the promise to those faithful to the Torah. The salvation prophecy of 33,17-24 can be considered an expanded and personalised prophetic adaptation of this concluding liturgical element of blessing.

The king in Isa 33,17 is most often identified with YHWH⁽⁵⁵⁾, though a few scholars argue that this verse refers to a human figure⁽⁵⁶⁾. The strongest argument in favour of the first opinion is v. 22, which calls YHWH commander, ruler and king. However, YHWH's kingship does not exclude the coexistence of a subordinate human king. There are further problems in identifying מֶלֶךְ with YHWH. First, the lack of the definite article is most striking if מֶלֶךְ stands for YHWH. Second, "seeing God" is also problematic, especially in such a late period, as this text is usually dated⁽⁵⁷⁾. Third, יָפִי, 'beauty' nowhere belongs to the characteristics of YHWH. God may appear as majestic, kind, but not as beautiful⁽⁵⁸⁾. יָפִי is a physical quality, used for the outward appearance

⁽⁵³⁾ Cf. מִצִּיּוֹן in vv. 8 and 15.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Cf. Ps 15; 24; S. MOWINCKEL, *Psalmstudien* (Amsterdam 1961) II, 237; GUNKEL, "Jesaja 33", 192-194.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ KAISER, *Jesaja*, 275; WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1314; SWEENEY, *Isaiah*, 428; WASCHKE, "Jesaja 33", 522.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ ALEXANDER, *Isaiah*, 13; CLEMENTS, *Isaiah*, 269; BEUKEN, *Isaiah*, 247, 270. DUHM, *Jesaja*, 245, and YOUNG, *Isaiah*, II, 421, argue that this refers to the Messiah.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ I doubt that the Isaianic vision (!) of YHWH in 6,5 (WILLIAMSON, *Book*, 226; BERGES, *Jesaja*, 245; WASCHKE, "Jesaja 33", 528), or the cultic term of seeing God's face (Ps 11,7; KAISER, *Jesaja*, 274), could be equalled with the promise of Isa 33,17. Isa 52,8, which is also presumed to support the divine king interpretation in 33,17 (BERGES, *Jesaja*, 245), is a problematic text (cf. LXX; 1QIsa^a). Moreover, Isa 52,8 does not speak about seeing YHWH as in 33,17, but probably seeing his return to Zion (so the MT). Cf. also 35,2; 40,5; 66,18.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Debating this, MOWINCKEL, *Psalmstudien*, II, 237, refers to the phrase לְחֻזֹּת בְּנֶעֱם יְיָ in Ps 27,4. While נֶעֱם can be used in certain cases with a sense close to יָפִי (Sol 1,16; 7,7), yet נֶעֱם means 'kindness, friendliness' (2 Sam 1,26; Ps 90,17 [וַיְהִי נֶעֱם אֲדָנִי אֱלֹהֵי עַלְיָו]; cf. HALOT). It may be compared with מִיָּב (Ps 133,1; Prov 24,25; Job 36,11), which under certain conditions can also refer to handsome

of humans, plants or ornaments. Strikingly, Jer 10,4 uses יִפֶּה in connection with the idols⁽⁵⁹⁾.

As for the positive evidence, יִפֶּה characterises a human king in Ps 45,3; 1 Sam 16,12; 17,42; Ezek 28,12⁽⁶⁰⁾. Furthermore, the position of מֶלֶךְ at the beginning of the sentence suggests that this word is emphatic, alluding to a situation in which there is no human king in Jerusalem, but everyone is eager to find one there⁽⁶¹⁾. Last, in v. 17 מֶלֶךְ / אֶרֶץ are used in parallelism. If אֶרֶץ has a political significance in this place, it makes most sense to think similarly of מֶלֶךְ as well. The presence of a human king, the second to YHWH, is also presupposed by v. 21, as argued below.

V. 17b is also astonishing. אֶרֶץ מְרַחֵקִים, that the returnees are promised to see, is often interpreted as a land that stretches far away, a broad and wide land⁽⁶²⁾. This can hardly be correct, however, since in all other instances the construction [מִן]רַחֵק[ים] means “a distant land”, “far land”⁽⁶³⁾.

This verse has serious implications for the date and provenance of

outward appearance, but hardly so with YHWH. The same Ps 27,13 has לִרְאוֹת in בְּמוֹצֵי יְהוָה, suggesting that in case of YHWH נֶעַם and טוֹב are indeed similar (see also Ps 16,11; 135,3; 147,1).

⁽⁵⁹⁾ The Egyptian examples of the divinity’s beauty cited by WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1315-1316, are most probably related to the physical appearance of these gods, either as exposed by cultic statues, or through the divine-human Egyptian king. Neither of these is relevant for the biblical text.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Cf. 1 Sam 25,3; 1 Kgs 1,3; Est 1,11; 2,7; Ezek 16,13, using יִפֶּה for a queen.

⁽⁶¹⁾ The last memory of the people leaving Jerusalem for exile was that their king was taken away and foreigners appeared in the city (cf. vv. 18-19).

⁽⁶²⁾ Cf. NRSV; NIV; DUHM, *Jesaja*, 245; YOUNG, *Isaiah*, II, 422.

⁽⁶³⁾ Prov 25,25; Isa 13,5; 46,11; Jer 6,20; 8,19. See also Deut 29,21; Josh 9,6,9; 1 Kgs 8,41; Isa 8,9; 39,3; Jer 4,16. “Large country” would be אֶרֶץ רַחֲבָה (cf. Ex 3,8; Neh 9,35; see also Gen 13,17; 26,22; 34,21; Ex 34,24; Jdg 18,10; 1 Chr 4,40; Job 38,18; Isa 8,8; 22,18; cf. Isa 30,23). אֶרֶץ מְרַחֵקִים in Jer 8,19 is especially important. When exegetes explain its meaning as “from throughout the land”, they do this by referring to Isa 33,17. Cf. W. RUDOLPH, *Jeremia* (HAT 12; Tübingen 1968) 62; P.C. CRAIGIE et al., *Jeremiah 1-25* (WBC 26; Waco, TX 1991) 137. But it is more likely that Jer 8,19 (at least from אֶרֶץ מְרַחֵקִים) quotes the exiled (distant) people, being a later addition. This was already presupposed by some for the מְדוּנָה-sentence, but Craigie argued convincingly that the Jeremianic syntax מְדוּנָה+אֶרֶץ forms a coherent unit. As an insertion, Jer 8,19a could be YHWH’s word rather than the prophet’s. It is possible that Jer 8,19 refers to Isa 33,17, but that need not mean that its understanding of YHWH as king coincides with the intention of the author of Isa 33,17 (contra BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen*, 185). Jer 8,19 may have relied on the larger context of Isa 33,17 (cf. vv. 5.22).

this prophecy. While in most other cases “distant land” refers to Mesopotamia or Persia, in Isa 33,17 it probably signifies Canaan as viewed from Mesopotamia, thus also presupposing an audience somewhere by the rivers of Babylon. This does not only corresponds to vv. 14-16 (who is going to dwell in Zion?), but also to vv. 18-19. The shocking questions of people wandering where foreign tribute gatherers could have disappeared can be well-understood if put in the mouths of those arriving home, but not from those already living in Zion.

The phrase *מְקוֹם יְהוָה אֲדִיר* in v. 21 is notoriously difficult. The problem is caused mainly by the words *אֲדִיר יְהוָה*. It is syntactically impossible to consider *אֲדִיר* an adjective here⁽⁶⁴⁾. Some separate the two words rendering “the mighty one, YHWH”⁽⁶⁵⁾. However, the lack of the definite article would be again troubling. Other scholars propose to change *יְהוָה* into *יְהוּה*, translating “there will be a mighty one for us”⁽⁶⁶⁾. But the emendation has no textual support. Moreover, the lack of the article would be a problem again, for while *אֲדִיר* is used as an adjective connected to the name or person of YHWH (1 Sam 4,8; Ps 8,2.10; 75,6; 93,4), in a nominal form it never substitutes YHWH.

It is possible, however, to leave the MT unchanged and still arrive to an acceptable interpretation. I propose to translate *יְהוָה אֲדִיר* most simply as a genitival construction, “the mighty one of YHWH”. It is remarkable that when used as a noun, *אֲדִיר* refers almost exclusively to high rank officials⁽⁶⁷⁾. There are two important cases where *אֲדִיר* refers to a king. The first case is Isa 10,34. According to the original intention of Isa 10,28-34 as a prophecy directed against Jerusalem (cf. 11,1), the phrase *יְהוָה אֲדִיר* in 10,34 refers to the fall of Zion (“Lebanon”) by “a mighty one”, who will cut it off like trees⁽⁶⁸⁾. This *אֲדִיר* who will

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Cf. KJV: “glorious Lord”.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ A. DILLMANN, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (Leipzig 1890^s) 299.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*, 1311.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Jdg 5,13.25; 2 Chr 23,20; Neh 3,5; 10,30; Jer 14,3; 25,34.36; Nah 2,6; 3,18; Zech 11,2. *אֲדִיר* is never used in an abstract sense as “majesty” (Wildberger), or “might” (Young).

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Contra the unnecessary emendations of e.g. H. WILDBERGER, *Jesaja*. Kapitel 1-12 (BKAT X/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972) 425; H. BARTH, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit*. Israel und Assur als Thema einer produktiven Neuinterpretation der Jesajaüberlieferung (WMANT 48; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1977) 69-72, see, e.g., S. MOWINCKEL, “Die Komposition des Jesajabuches Kap. 1-39”, *AcOr* 11 (1933) 283-284; G.C.I. WONG, “Deliverance or destruction? Isaiah x 33-34 in the final form of Isaiah x-xi”, *VT* 53 (2003) 544-552.

cause Jerusalem to fall is the Assyrian king (cf. 10,15; 28,2). The second text is Jer 30,21, where **אֲדִיר** is paralleled by **מִשָּׁל**, both of which allude to the future king of Israel who God promises to bring forth from among his people. It is most likely therefore that **אֲדִיר יְהוָה**, “the mighty one of YHWH”, refers to a human king in Jerusalem, as in v. 17 above.

The first part of v. 21 should be delimited as follows:

כִּי אֶשֶׁם אֲדִיר יְהוָה לָנוּ	For there a mighty one of YHWH will
מְקוֹם־נְהָרִים	be to us (like) a place of rivers ⁽⁶⁹⁾ ,
יָאֲרִים רַחְבֵּי יָדַיִם	(like) spacious channels ⁽⁷⁰⁾ .

The mighty waters recall the idea of mighty ships (**צִי אֲדִיר** / **אֲנִי־שֵׁיט**), both of which are obviously symbolic images. The metaphors of ship are followed by an assertion of YHWH as commander, leader and king (v. 22), but v. 23a returns again to the theme of ships. This unusual sequence determined some scholars either to abandon vv. 21b.23a⁽⁷¹⁾, or to relocate v. 23a after 21⁽⁷²⁾. However, it is curious that vv. 21b.23 as late insertions were separated from each other. It would be more natural to presuppose that the original sequence was blurred by the secondary insertion of v. 22. But is the order of vv. 21-23 really so strange after all? Ships with a mast and sail represent loftiness, pride and arrogance. As in Isa 2,16, **אֲנִי־שֵׁיט** and **צִי אֲדִיר** are not enemy ships, but Judean vessels symbolising human power⁽⁷³⁾. But where there is an **אֲדִיר יְהוָה**, there is no place for **צִי אֲדִיר**. It is not the mighty ships, but YHWH, who saves his people⁽⁷⁴⁾. Therefore the demolition of Judah’s lofty ships is an essential sign of faith relying solely on YHWH’s saving power. In this reading each of vv. 21-23 fits the reasoning of the author well and need not be considered secondary.

V. 23b is unclear, but the division of spoils among the lame may continue the previous idea that it is not human power which saves Zion (cf. Isa 31,8)⁽⁷⁵⁾. V. 23b may point back to v. 4 and identify the

⁽⁶⁹⁾ **מְקוֹם־נְהָרִים** probably alludes to a place rich in waters.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ For **רַחְבֵּי יָדַיִם**, cf. also Gen 34,21; Jdg 18,10; 1 Chr 4,40; Isa 22,18.

⁽⁷¹⁾ KAISER, *Jesaja*, 276-277; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 86.

⁽⁷²⁾ FOHRER, *Jesaja*, 139; JPS Tanakh (1985).

⁽⁷³⁾ Contra, e.g., M.E.W. THOMPSON, “Vision, Reality and Worship: Isaiah 33”, *ExpT* 113 (2002) 329. The suffix of **חֲבִלָּךְ** also refers to Judeans — contra H.R. HOLMYARD, “Does Isaiah 33:23 Address Israel or Israel’s Enemy?”, *BibSac* 152 (1995) 273-278.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Note the part. **כִּי** and the emphatic **יִשְׁעֵנוּ** in v. 22, as well as the military (!) terminology (commander, leader) in v. 22.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Whether **עֵד** should be **עִוֵּר**, ‘blind’ (BHS³ with support from the Tg), is uncertain.

plunderers of the enemy with Zion. At the same time, the imagery of lame is connected to the sickness-theme of v. 24.

To conclude, vv. 13-24 form a coherent unit in which we find allusions to the earlier part of the prophecy, suggesting that this passage was composed in view of the former text. However, its focus on the returnees and the description of a new Jerusalem, the different addressees, as well as the reinterpretation of the earlier motifs suggest that vv. 13-24 derives from a later occasion than vv. 1-12.

As noted, v. 6 belongs neither to vv. 1+4, nor to vv. 2-3+5+7-12. Its focus and intention is akin to vv. 13-24, for both of which v. 5 is a central text, interpreted differently from its original meaning. V. 6 reads 33,5 as a prediction for the future⁽⁷⁶⁾ in which *מִשְׁפָּט* and *צִדְקָה* have positive connotations for Israel, the god-fearing people. Similarly v. 15, connects *מִשְׁפָּט* and *צִדְקָה* to the righteous life of the god-fearing inhabitants of Zion (cf. Isa 1,21). As the protection of the city is warranted by YHWH, the stronghold (*חֹסֶן*), in v. 6, so also v. 16 (cf. vv. 20-23) places the emphasis on the security of Jerusalem, the *מְרוֹמִים* and *מִשְׁנֵב*, alluding to *מְרוֹם* and *נִשְׁבָּה* in v. 5.

To sum up, Isa 33 is not one literary unit, but a complex composition of three distinctive passages. Vv. 1+4 is the basic text, expanded in a secondary stage by vv. 2-3+5+7-12, which forms a communal lament. As a third step vv. 6+13-24 were added, which formally represent an elaborated version of entrance-liturgies. The following section is supposed to clarify the theological background and the intertextual relationships of these passages.

II. Isaiah 33 in its Context

1. Isa 33,1+4: The Primary Text

The earliest text on which all subsequent expansions are built is the *הִי-הוּא*-cry of 33,1+4. The combination *שׁוּדָד* and *בּוֹגַד* used in connection with the enemy also appears (in reversed order) in Isa 21,2, hinting at literary relationship. In Isa 21,2 *שׁוּדָד* and *בּוֹגַד* refer to Babylon⁽⁷⁷⁾, who

⁽⁷⁶⁾ *מִלֵּא* qatal allows this; cf. note 24 above.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ According to BEUKEN ("Jesaja 33", 15), *שׁוּדָד* and *בּוֹגַד* refer to the Elamites and Medians (Persians) both in Isa 21,2 and 33,1 (cf. also BERGES, *Jesaja*, 243). This identification creates difficulties for 21,1-10, where only these two verbs explain why Babylon is destroyed. For Chaldea as *בּוֹגַד* and *שׁוּדָד* in 21,2, see D.S. VANDERHOOF, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets* (HSM 59; Atlanta, GA 1999) 130, n. 37.

causes the groaning (אִנְחָה) of the oppressed, inciting the intervention of YHWH by way of Elam and Media. Does Isa 33,1 also refer to Babylon? Intertextual allusions do not necessarily imply identical interpretations. Although 33,1 is in general considered secondary to 21,2, it seems rather that the opposite is the case. Isa 21 does not clarify to whose groaning⁽⁷⁸⁾ YHWH replies by punishing the שׂוֹדֵד and בּוֹגֵד. From the larger context of 33,1, however, it becomes clear that it has caused much suffering to Judah (33,7-9). “Her groaning” (אִנְחָה) in 21,2 may actually allude to the prayer of the oppressed people in 33,2-3⁽⁷⁹⁾. Isa 21,2 can therefore be explained from (i.e. it presupposes) 33,1.

Another probable case of intertextuality in 33,1 depends on a textual emendation. Rashi and many others suggested that כָּלֵתָךְ (from the *hapax* גִּלָּה) should be emended to כָּלֵתְךָ⁽⁸⁰⁾, a variant confirmed by 1QIsa^a and supported by the syntax⁽⁸¹⁾. If the reading כָּלֵתְךָ is accepted, then the word pair תָּמַם and כָּלָה, as well as שׂוֹדֵד, bring v. 1 particularly close to Isa 16,4, which also speaks about the disappearance of the — most likely Assyrian⁽⁸²⁾ — oppressor.

The possible Assyrian addressee behind 33,1+4 is underlined by comparing its message to Isa 10,12⁽⁸³⁾. In Isa 10, YHWH promises to punish the proud Assyria after he has finished all his work in Zion which points to a common theology behind these verses (temporised punishment). Besides, the above noted imagery of locusts in 33,4 may also remind us of Assyria (Nah 3,15-17) as the primary addressee⁽⁸⁴⁾.

Insofar as other יְהוֹשִׁיעַ prophecies in the collection of Isa 28–32 can at

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Note the 3rd pers. sg. fem. suffix in אִנְחָהּ.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ For Babylon as בּוֹגֵד, cf. Isa 24,16 (?); Hab 1,13; 2,5. For שׂוֹדֵד, see Isa 16,4; Jer 6,26; 12,12; 15,8; 48,8.18.32; Jer 51,48.53.56.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ From כָּלָה, ‘to finish / complete’. Cf. BDB 649; DUHM, *Jesaja*, 240; ROBERTS, “Isaiah 33”, 18. For תָּמַם and כָּלָה used together, see also Isa 16,4; Jer 44,27; Lam 3,22; Dan 9,24. The כ > ט change, cf. E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Der Text des Alten Testaments. Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart⁵ 1988) 119.

⁽⁸¹⁾ When כָּלָה is related to a verb, it is generally followed by ל + inf. Cf. Gen 17,22; 18,33; 24,19; 43,2; Ex 31,18; Deut 26,12; Josh 19,49; Ruth 3,3; 1 Kgs 3,1; Jer 51,63; Amos 7,2. The only exception is Dan 12,7.

⁽⁸²⁾ This could be inferred from the friendly attitude towards Moab which changed considerably in the post-exilic period. It is not clear though whether Assyria has actually fallen or only left the country. It may be Isa 16,4, which alludes to 33,1+4.

⁽⁸³⁾ Cf. also ROBERTS, “Isaiah 33”, 19.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ The attack of the enemy against Assyria is also typified as a locust invasion in Nah 2 (cf. Joel 1–2; Jer 51,14). As BEUKEN (“Jesaja 33”, 16) noted, the imagery of booty also appears in Assyria-related contexts in Isa 8,1.4; 10,6.14.

least partially be dated to the Assyrian period, one may assume that Isa 33,1+4 once closed an earlier collection of דברי-text by pronouncing judgment on Assyria, who for a little while had become the axe of YHWH cutting the mighty trees of Israel and Judah. The role of 33,1+4 was similar to the anti-Assyrian prophecy in Isa 10, which also appears as a culmination of Israel-related prophecies⁽⁸⁵⁾.

2. Isa 33,2-3+5+7-12: The First Expansion

Vv. 1+4 look forward to the time when the enemy will have finished the work assigned to it by YHWH. The first expansion of this text takes up the idea of timing, reminding YHWH that following the fulfilment of the first part of the earlier prophecy, the time has come to fulfil the second part of the promise (cf. Ps 102,14; Zech 1,12). For this purpose, the author uses the form of communal laments with prayer, description and oracle. When discussing the intertextual connections of Isa 33, scholars mostly point out sporadic lexical relationships between Isa 33 and other texts, but they give little attention to the formal similarities between Isa 33 and other Isaianic passages⁽⁸⁶⁾.

While 1st pl. formulas are not uncommon to Isaiah, they appear rarely in the context of a prayer. The first text to be mentioned is Isa 26, which also includes communal lament. The whispered prayer alluded to in 26,16, from the time when Judah was under oppression (צרה), could be 33,2-3 (cf. בעת צרה), reminding in 26,18 that the related oracle (33,10-12) has remained unfulfilled. Isa 26 also presents the humiliation of “the city” (26,5), the exaltation of YHWH (26,11), the destruction scenes (26,5-6), and an oracle (26,19-21) which sets a new date for the realisation of the old prophecy (עדי-עבר-זמן / כמעט-דנה). Beyond formal similarities, there is also a close lexical and thematic connection between the two passages⁽⁸⁷⁾. However, Isa 26 presents a

⁽⁸⁵⁾ Contra WASCHKE (“Jesaja 33”, 530), who considers Isa 32 the closure of the דברי-collection.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ For example, BEUKEN (“Jesaja 33”, 13-15) argues that 33,2 can be seen as mirroring Isa 8,17.22-23; 12; 25,9.10; 51,5; 59,1.11. BERGES (*Jesaja*, 246, 248) maintains that 33,24 alludes to 1,4; 6,7; 40,2 and Lam 4,22. It is difficult to imagine, however, that an author composes each verse in view of so many references and yet arrives to a coherent final text. For the problems with this way of dealing with intertextuality, see also WASCHKE, “Jesaja 33”, 524, who emphasises the importance of “inhaltliche und strukturelle Analogien”.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ 33,2 | 26,8 (cf. also 25,9); 33,2 (לבקרים) | 26,9 (בלילה); 33,5 | 26,8 (מרום / מרחם); 33,5 | 26,8 (ארח משפך); cf. 26,16; משפט is used here as judgment on Judah);

reinterpreted version of Isa 33, knowing it probably in its present form⁽⁸⁸⁾. A second comparable text is Isa 59, in which the prophet also speaks in the name of a group, addressing YHWH directly (59,12). The prophet and his community expect the manifestation of justice, righteousness and deliverance — key terms in Isa 33 —, obstructed by the sins of the people⁽⁸⁹⁾. Yet there is a stronger awareness here of the current iniquity of the people. The emphasis on the delayed deliverance (59,9-11) may directly hint — as in Isa 26,18 — at the community's trouble with earlier promises of salvation, in particular 33,1.4.10-12. The closing section, 59,15b-21, appears to be an oracle comparable to 33,10-12, i.e. an answer to the earlier prayer of the community. Third, Isa 63,7-64,11, is also formulated as a communal lament, including a prayer, a description of the desolation (64,9-10), ending in 64,11 with a question expecting a reaction. Isa 65 can perhaps be read as the oracular response of YHWH to this request.

These three texts are later than Isa 33,2-3+5+7-10⁽⁹⁰⁾. One may also ask which earlier passages from Isaiah could have been used at this point. We must be aware though that some lexemes may be typical for a type of genre rather than being intertextual allusions⁽⁹¹⁾.

Scholars recognise a connection between Isa 33,5 and 1,21, where Jerusalem in its early days is portrayed as *מִלְאֲחֵי מִשְׁפָּט צָדֵק יֵלֵין בָּהּ* ⁽⁹²⁾. However, 1,21 refers to the just and righteous deeds of the inhabitants of the city, unlike 33,5. More important is 1,27, according to which Zion will be redeemed through *מִשְׁפָּט* and *צָדִיקָה*. This latter implies that

33,5 | 26,9 (via *מִשְׁפָּט* people learn *צָדֵק*); 33,6 (אֲמוֹנָה עֲתִיד) | 26,4 (צֹר עוֹלָמִים); 33,6 (הֶסֶן יִשְׁעָה) | 26,1 (יִשְׁעָה יִשִּׁית חוֹמוֹת וְחָלַל); 33,11 | 26,11; 33,14-15 | 26,2.7 (the *צָדִיק* and *מִשְׁפָּט*; this latter only here in this sense in Isaiah); 33,16-21 | 26,1 (עֵר עֵר); 33,22 | 26,13. Note also the frequent *בִּלְ*'s.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ A particular case of reinterpretation appears in 26,17-18. The symbols of 33,11, *חַיִּל*, *הִרָה*, *רוּחַ*, reappear in 26,17-18, but with an entirely new sense, related to Israel. Another striking case of reinterpreting allusion is *בְּלִי-קִצּוֹר אֶרֶץ* in 26,15, probably referring to *אֶרֶץ מְרֻחָקִים* in 33,17.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ Subtle allusions to 33,14-16 may be recognised in the characterisation of the prophet's audience in 59,2-8.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Isa 37 also includes a description of the threat (37,1-13), a prayer for deliverance (37,15-20) and an oracle (37,21-35). Unfortunately, the space does not allow me to deal here with the complex relationship between Isa 33 and 37. See note 118 below.

⁽⁹¹⁾ So *קָה* in 33,2 is not necessarily a hint at 8,17, but rather a common formula in prayers (cf. Ps 25,5; 27,14; 40,2; 130,5; Isa 25,9; 26,8; 59,9.11). *לְבָקָרִים* may hint at Isa 28,19, but the motif of morning is frequent in prayers.

⁽⁹²⁾ WILLIAMSON, *Book*, 233-234; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 87.

by punishing Jerusalem God will restore the earlier order⁽⁹³⁾. Isa 1,27 seems to be based on 5,16, but it also goes beyond it in that 5,16 is not about the redemption of the city. As it was argued above, 33,5 also has strong connections to 5,16 and maintains that this prediction regarding the elevation of YHWH (גְּבוּהָ) in justice and righteousness is now fulfilled. Thus both 1,27 and 33,5 go back to 5,16, but the idea of the redemption of Jerusalem is more emphatic in 1,27 than in 33,5, questioning that the latter would be actually based on 1,27.

In Isa 5,15-16, the exaltation of YHWH is connected with the humiliation of Judah, with special emphasis on its leaders. Isa 5,15-16 is also referred to by 2,5-22, another important text for 33,2-3+5+7-12. The central theme of 2,5-22 is the exaltation of YHWH alone and the punishment of the haughty nation⁽⁹⁴⁾. The weeping military leaders in 33,7 may be an example of this humiliation. In this context, it is even arguable that the geographical metaphors of 33,9 refer to 2,13-14⁽⁹⁵⁾. Isa 33,7-9 seems to restate that 2,5-22 was fulfilled.

It is often noted that the unusual אֲרִיאֵל in 33,7 hints at אֲרִיאֵל in 29,1, the Isaianic prophecy against Jerusalem in which the theme of humiliation of the proud ancient city also plays a prominent role⁽⁹⁶⁾. In this connection the phonetic similarity between חֲצָה צַעֲקוֹן אֲרִיאֵל (33,7) and וְהִצִּיקוּהוּ לְאֲרִיאֵל (29,2) is also noteworthy⁽⁹⁷⁾.

The imagery of hay and straw in v. 11 has a significant parallel in Isa 5,24, the context from which 5,16 was also taken up in 33,5. In this earlier text Israel is compared to חֲשֵׁשׁ and קֶשֶׂה, who will be consumed (אֲכָל) by the enemy⁽⁹⁸⁾. The metaphor of קֶשֶׂה appears only in Isa 32,13, but its synonyms, שְׂמִיר and שִׁית belong to the most favourite motifs of the book, mostly as symbols for the judgment on Judah or Israel (5,6;

⁽⁹³⁾ Isa 1,25 implies punishment and וְאִשְׁכְּבָה in 1,26 alludes to restoration.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Cf. נִשְׁגַּב (as in 33,5); נִשְׁגַּב, נִשְׁגַּב / רִם, נִשְׁגַּב, עֵינֵי גְבוּהָ (2,11.12; cf. 5,15-16).

⁽⁹⁵⁾ For Lebanon and Carmel, cf. also 10,34; 29,17; 35,2. See also Isa 24,4-12, which appears to be a later allusion to 33,7-9 (cf. 33,1 | 24,16; 33,7 | 24,11; 33,8 | 24,12; 33,9 | 24,4.7; 33,17.22 | 24,23).

⁽⁹⁶⁾ See שָׁפֵל in 29,4 with 2,9.11.12.17; 5,15; 10,33; 32,19.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ Note also אֲכָלָה in 29,6, although this probably refers here to the destruction of Jerusalem (1,7; 5,24; 9,18; 10,16.17; cf. also 28,2) and not the enemy (26,11; 30,27.30.33). הַפֶּקֶד, whether a sg. 3 fem., or a sg. 2 masc., has no other antecedent in the previous verse. See also צֹר (29,3; cf. 33,2), הַמֶּן (29,5; 33,3), and קָל (29,6; 33,3). The diachronic aspect of the relationship between Isa 33 and the later expansion of 29,1-8 is not entirely clear. KUSTÁR (*Krankheit*, 103) assigns 29,5-7 and Isa 33 (with 30,27-33) to the same author.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ מֵאֵס עֲדִים appears only here. Cf. 5,24 (מֵאֵסוּ אֶת תּוֹרֵת יְהוּדָה) with 33,8 (מֵאֵס עֲדִים).

7,23-25; 9,17 [cf. אכל / שם]; 10,17; 27,4; 29,6). The message of 5,24 is inverted in 33,11-12⁽⁹⁹⁾.

As for the date of vv. 2-3+5+7-12, this edition presupposes that the enemy has not yet fallen. The audience is a lamenting community, which looks forward to being delivered. The image of heroes and messengers wailing in the streets after being punished for a treaty broken with a foreign power, does not appear to be stereotypical, but it may reflect actual historical circumstances. Following the retaliatory campaign during Jehoiachin in 598, part of the elite and military personnel from Judah were deported to Babylon (2 Kgs 24,10-16). Whether it is this deportation which made the warriors of Jerusalem cry, or whether they were the warriors left by the Babylonians during the later siege of 587 (2 Kgs 25,19; 25,23; Jer 40,7; 41,3)⁽¹⁰⁰⁾, or the lament was composed during the siege, before the actual fall of the city to counsel those inside the walls (cf. 33,10-12), it is difficult to tell. It is probable, nevertheless, that the text originates from these difficult years of Judah.

3. *Isa 33,6+13-24: The Second Expansion*

While the lamentation and oracle in Isa 33,1-5.7-12 is concerned with the oppression of Jerusalem and the punishment of its enemy, the second expansion, 33,6+13-24, changes the perspective to the glorious Zion and those planning to dwell there. Isa 33,6+13-24 is written as an expansion of the previous text, especially focused on the central v. 5⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

Isa 33,6, comparing YHWH to a fortification, reflects the theology of cultic poetry⁽¹⁰²⁾. The emphasis on the cultic role of Zion is also evident in 33,14-16, as mentioned. Furthermore, the description of Jerusalem in vv. 16.20-21 uses mythological language and is acquainted with the theology of the Zion psalms Ps 46; 48 and

⁽⁹⁹⁾ For a similar reversion, see Isa 30,27.30.33, which apparently also builds on anti-Israel texts (cf. especially 30,30 with 28,2).

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ On the crying people, see also the mourners of Jer 41,5, probably wailing for the city Jerusalem.

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ BEUKEN, "Jesaja 33", 16-17 recognised in v. 5-6 an allusion to Isa 11,1-10. The problem with this opinion is that the motif of רוח, which is so central to Isa 11, plays no role in 33,5-6. It is also difficult to explain why 33,5-6 would have picked out only these lexemes from Isa 11, and left other similarly important ones (e.g., עצה, בינה) unmentioned.

⁽¹⁰²⁾ Cf. Isa 26,1 and note 36 above.

76⁽¹⁰³⁾. For instance, describing Jerusalem as מְרוֹמִים and מַצְדּוֹת סֻלְעִים in Isa 33,16 (cf. Ps 46,8) reminds one of Baal’s home is in the heights of Zaphon (*mrym spn / srrt*) and the watery place of 33,21 (cf. Ps 46,5) of the dwelling place of El at the headwaters of rivers (*nhrm*), at the confluence of depths (*‘dt / ‘apq thmtm*)⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. It is even probable that מְרוֹמִים in 33,17 parallels the distant place of the divine mountain Zaphon (cf. מְרוֹמִים יְרֵכָה צֶפֶן in Ps 48,3; see also Jer 31,8). The fire imagery of 33,14 also resonates with mythological descriptions of the divine mountain⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. According to Ezek 28,14-16 the blameless king of Tyre had lived among the fiery stones on the mountain of God from where he was removed when he was found violent and sinful. Formally speaking, the imperative in Ps 46,9 parallels Isa 33,20.

In vv. 33,18-19.21.23 the author appears to reinterpret and historicise this cultic-mythological imagery, pointing to a specific context in which it receives concrete validity. This means that this pericope needs to be read in an Isaianic (historic) perspective⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. To mention some sporadic connections with Isa, חֵסֶן and אוֹצֵר as ‘wealth’ and ‘treasure’ can be related to Isa 2,7: the land of Israel was filled with richness, which could not have saved them (2,20; cf. Jer 20,5), but Jerusalem’s new values will provide secure protection for the city (33,6). The fiery furnace on the mountain of God in 33,14 has other parallels in 31,9 and 30,33⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. The list of Isa 33,15 hints at former iniquities of Israel’s ancestors in 1,15-17.21.23, and it may also contain an inverted allusion to 6,9-11⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. Isa 33,19 referring to the foreign enemy with an unintelligible speech obviously points to 28,11. The ship imagery of 33,21.23, an expression of pride and reliance on one’s own power instead of YHWH, alludes to 2,16. The theme of healing (from sins) in 33,24 reminds us of 1,5-6 and 6,10.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ MOWINCKEL, *Psalmenstudien*, II, 236; VERMEYLEN, *Isaïe*, I, 435; ROBERTS, “Isaiah 33”, 22-23; BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen*, 187.

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ M.S. SMITH, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* (SVT 55; Leiden 1994) I, 225-234. For the amalgamation of the two locations in the biblical tradition, see SMITH, *Baal*, 232-233. For the waters, cf. also Joel 4,18; Ezek 47,1-12; Zech 14,8.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ J.J.M. ROBERTS, “Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire”, *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (ed. T. ISHIDA) (Winona Lake, IN 1982) 101-102.

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Cf. also GUNKEL, “Jesaja 33”, 194; WASCHKE, “Jesaja 33”, 524.

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ It is questionable that v. 14 would refer to Isa 6,7 (so BERGES, *Jesaja*, 245). In Isa 6 the motif of fire does not appear explicitly. Further, 33,14 alludes as an expansion of the previous pericope to vv. 11-12.

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ KUSTAR, *Krankheit*, 88; WASCHKE, “Jesaja 33”, 529.

Beside these, the imagery of kingship in Isa 33,13-24 is particularly important. As noted, vv. 17 and 21 presuppose an indirect form of theocracy. The human king appears to be an anti-type of the foreign ruler in several respects. First, the appearance of the new monarch in Jerusalem in v. 17 is contrasted with the disappearance of the oppressors in vv. 18-19⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. Second, characterising the new king as *אֲדִיר יְהוָה* contrasts him with the Assyrian king, the former *אֲדִיר [יהוה]* of Isa 10,34 or *וְאִמְץ לְאֹדֵנִי* of Isa 28,2 (Isa 28 was also cited by 33,19!). Third, presenting the new king as protective *נֹהֵרִים* and *יֹאֲרִים* reminds the reader of Isaiah of Isa 8,7-8, in which Assyria is compared to a mighty river (*הַנָּהָר הַעֲצוּמִים וְהַרְבִּים*), overflowing all its banks, swirling over and washing away the land of Immanuel. In the above mentioned 28,2.15.17-18, the enemy is a sweeping flood passing through YHWH's country, which feels itself secure without YHWH's protection⁽¹¹⁰⁾. *נֹהֵרִים* and *יֹאֲרִים* may also allude to the Euphrates and the Nile, and implicitly to the northern and southern border of the empire of the new Davidic king⁽¹¹¹⁾.

The description of Jerusalem as a royal city compared to a tent (*אֹהֶל*) shows a link with Isa 4,2-6; 16,4-5 and 32,1-2 (cf. also *סֶכֶת דָּוִד* in Am 9,11). Isa 4,2-6 combines the imagery of kingship (*צֶמַח יְהוָה* / *פְּרִי הָאָרֶץ*) with the protection offered to Zion. Over against the enemy symbolised as a rainstorm (28,2), 4,5-6 speaks about canopy (*חֹפֶה*), hut (*סֶכֶה*; cf. Ps 76,2), refuge (*מִסְתּוֹר*) and shelter (*מִחֲסֶה*; cf. also Isa 25,4; Ps 46,2). In Isa 16,4-5, the king in the tent of David (*אֹהֶל*) offers protection for refugees. In Isa 32,1-2, the righteous king and his officers are compared to a shelter (*סֶכֶת*) before a rainstorm and to streams of waters (*פְּלִימִים*) on a dry place.

The secure dwelling alongside a watery place brings Isa 33,6+13-24 particularly close to Isa 32. The scene of destruction in 32,14 is expanded there with the promise of restoration, described in a language close to Isa 33. According to 32,18 the people live in a secure settlement (*בְּנוֹהַ שְׁלוֹם*) and an untroubled resting place (*בְּמִנוּחַת שְׁאֲנוֹת*; cf. *נֹחַ שְׁאֲנָן* in 33,20). The prosperity of its abode (*מִשְׁכָּן*; cf. *אֹהֶל* in 33,20) is to last for ever (*עַד-עוֹלָם*, 32,17; cf. 33,6.20). In both cases prosperity is the result of *מִשְׁפָּט* and *צְדָקָה* (32,16-17) and both emphasise the presence of great rivers (32,20 | 33,21). These two texts, both formally designed

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Cf. "you will see" (v. 17), "you will not see" (v. 19).

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Cf. also Isa 17,12-13; Ps 77,17-20.

⁽¹¹¹⁾ See Gen 15,18; Deut 11,24; Jos 13,2-7; 2 Sam 8,3; 1 Kgs 4,21.

as reinterpretations of earlier prophecies, probably go back to the same author.

Several arguments were mentioned above which date this text to not long after 539. The topic is the return from exile, but Zion is still the distant land (v. 17). What the returnees will discover in the city will surprise them (vv. 18-19). Vv. 6 and 20 portraying Jerusalem in nomadic pictures, as a tent and a settlement whose security is warranted by YHWH and not by mighty walls, may allude to the period before the rebuilding of the city walls. The fact that the mighty one of YHWH is presented as great rivers is wholly understandable if it addresses people living alongside such rivers in Babylon (Jer 51,13)⁽¹¹²⁾. It was not easy for the deportees established in a country with secure walls and fertile lands to return to a desolated homeland. The purpose of this prophecy may have been exactly to convince Judaeans to go back to Zion. The expectation of the emergence of the new Davidic king on the throne of Jerusalem (vv. 17.21) corresponds to the realities of this early post-539 period.

A final comment should be made on the role of Isa 33 in relation to the formation of the book of Isaiah. As noted in the introduction, Isa 33 is considered a unique chapter in the process of the formation of the book of Isaiah. The limits of this essay do not permit to delve into an elaborate discussion at this point. However, the analysis of Isa 33 above must have made it clear that some previous views regarding the redactional role of Isa 33 need to be revised.

Insofar as there is any relationship between Isa 33 and 56–66, that is not of a nature that it would presuppose the secondary origin of Isa 33 with respect to 56–66⁽¹¹³⁾. It is not less questionable, however, that Isa 33 would have been written as a text bridging Isa 40–55 to 1–32. While it is assumed that Isa 33,24 directly hints at 40,1-2⁽¹¹⁴⁾, yet it becomes clear at a closer look that the only lexical connection between the two texts is limited to עָן. This would certainly be surprising if 33,24 was composed as a deliberate allusion to 40,2. While the date of Isa 33,13-24 would allow interaction with Deutero-Isaianic passages, the lexical relationship is extremely limited, and the connection is mostly confined to common theological ideas, or methods (such as making use of certain cultic literary forms)⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

⁽¹¹²⁾ See also Nah 3,8. Cf. DILLMANN, *Jesaia*, 299; CLEMENTS, *Isaiah*, 270.

⁽¹¹³⁾ In contrast to BEUKEN, see, e.g., WILLIAMSON, *Book*, 230-238.

⁽¹¹⁴⁾ WILLIAMSON, *Book*, 225; BERGES, *Jesaja*, 248.

⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Cf. WILLIAMSON, *Book*, 224-229.

Instead, it appears that Isa 33 can be perfectly understood from Isa 1–33. In one way, Isa 33 has always functioned as a closure text. Isa 33,1+4 was written to bring a previous collection of יְהוָה-prophecies in Isa 28–32 to a close in the late Assyrian period⁽¹¹⁶⁾. At a later stage, when this collection was re-evaluated in view of the Babylonian attack on Jerusalem, Isa 33 was updated with vv. 2-3.5.7-12. This revision also expresses awareness of other Isaianic texts, especially Isa 2 and 5, but intertextuality is a rather common literary phenomenon in other יְהוָה-texts of Isa 28-32 as well. The final revision in 33,6+13-24 tends to present this chapter in relation to Isa 1, and to make of 33,24 a kind of *inclusio* to 1,5-6⁽¹¹⁷⁾. It is possible that some passages of Isa 1 and 33,6+13-23 have common origin and that the framing of the First Isaianic collection by Isa 1 and 33 was the work of the same editor⁽¹¹⁸⁾.

III. Conclusion

In contrast to the conclusion of most studies on Isa 33, this text presents far too many problems to be considered one literary unit. The textual complexities and the unevenness of this chapter can be solved neither by reckoning with isolate glosses, nor by presuming that Isa 33 follows a liturgical pattern, nor by viewing this text as a compendium of several intertexts.

As in other יְהוָה-prophecies in Isa 28–32, we have a short woe-cry at the bases of Isa 33, comprising vv. 1+4. These two verses concentrating on the fall of the unnamed oppressor reflect close theological and formal similarities. The basic idea of this utterance is that YHWH still

⁽¹¹⁶⁾ At this stage other anti-Israel prophecies in 28–32 were also supplemented with anti-Assyrian material.

⁽¹¹⁷⁾ KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 96-97. The importance of relating Isa 33 with Isa 1 was especially emphasised by WASCHKE, “Jesaja 33”, 525-529. One has to disagree with him, however, that Isa 33 would also parallel Isa 1 with regard to its structure (see, e.g., the different place of 1,4-5 and 33,24), or that the references to Isa 1 would be more important for Isa 33 than other Isaianic passages (cf. 5,16 and 33,5). The relationship with Isa 1 questions other assumptions that Isa 1 would have been composed as an introduction to Isa 1–66 as a whole.

⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Whether Isa 33 also includes the work of Deutero-Isaiah, is among the possibilities, although — contrary to the suggestion of Williamson — that is hardly possible for the entire pericope. It even remains a question whether he could have been the final editor. The intricate relationship between Isa 33 and 36–39 must now be left out of discussion. See in this regard BOSSHARD-NEPUSTIL, *Rezeptionen*, 187-188; KUSTÁR, *Krankheit*, 92-96.

has some work to do through the enemy, but as soon as he will have finished this work (in the future), the enemy will be destroyed.

The first expansion of this text is a communal lament with a prayer summoning YHWH to take action (vv. 2-3), a presentation of the cause of the lamentation (vv. 5.7-9), and an oracle reacting to the prayer (vv. 10-12). This expansion takes up the former prediction at the moment which is considered the time that YHWH has completed his work in Jerusalem. Unlike it is generally assumed, Isa 33,5 deals with the judgment and not the salvation of Jerusalem. God’s intervention in v. 5 is the deserved reaction to Judah’s act of breaking the covenant and treaty obligations towards his vassal and implicitly towards his God. This first expansion of 33,1+4 presupposes that Jerusalem is under judgment and looks forward to the destruction of the enemy.

The second expansion of the text is 33,6+13-24. This pericope, presenting an expanded form of entrance liturgies, takes up motifs appearing in vv. 1-12, especially vs. 5, but interprets them in a new way. The theme of the prophecy also shifts from the destruction of the enemy to the topic of who may dwell in Jerusalem, the city about to be restored. The restoration of the city is described in imaginary pictures relying on cultic-mythological traditions. Vv. 17.21 presuppose that there will be a human king in the city, the handsome and mighty one of YHWH, offering security. The text of this layer of the prophecy suggests a distance in space from Zion.

As for the contextual aspect of Isa 33, it was pointed out that 33,1+4 presents close similarities with Assyria-related prophecies and should perhaps be dated to the late Assyrian era. The communal lament which has v. 5 as its central text, gives a renewed understanding of Isa 5,16 and 2,5-22. This text is related to an assault against Jerusalem sometimes around 598 or 587. The final expansion, 33,6+13-24, presents the human king of Jerusalem as an anti-type of the Assyrian monarch, “the strong and mighty one of the Lord” (10,34; 28,2) and “the sweeping flood” (8,7-8; 28,2.15.17-18). The similarities in the description of Jerusalem in 32,14-20 suggest that the two texts may derive from the same author. Isa 33,6+13-24 addresses Jewish people with different attitudes towards YHWH, who still live far away from Zion, whose walls have not yet been built. The disappearance of the enemy and the concern with the return to and dwelling in Jerusalem suggest that this expansion comes from not long after 539 B.C. It probably intended to convince exiles to return to Judah.

Isa 33 always functioned as a closing text — first when concluding

the ׀׀׀-prophecies of the Assyrian period. But with the inclusion of vv. 13-24, it was demarcated as the final prophecy of the First-Isaianic collection. We have no compelling evidence that it would have been designed as a bridge connecting Isa 1-32 with subsequent sections of the developing corpus of Isaiah, namely 40–55 or 40–66.

Protestant Theological Institute
P-ta Avram Iancu 13
400124 Cluj Napoca
Romania

Csaba BALOGH

SUMMARY

In contrast to most opinions concerning Isa 33 this pericope is far too complex to be explained as one coherent literary unit. Isa 33 has a short anti-Assyrian woe-cry at its bases (vv. 1+4), which once closed the woe-cries of Isa 28–32. Vv. 1+4 were supplemented first (around 598 or 587) by a communal lament, vv. 2-3+5+7-12, bringing the idea of the punishment of Judah and the temporised destruction of the enemy in vv. 1+4 further. Second, (shortly after 539) vv. 1-5.7-12 were expanded by a salvation prophecy, vv. 6+13-24, concerning the returnees, the restoration of Jerusalem and the monarchy.

The Headings of the Psalms in the East Syriac Tradition Reconsidered

In the first half of the previous century the headings of the Psalms in the East Syriac tradition received a lot of attention, continuing a tradition initiated by the work of Baethgen at the end of the Nineteenth Century. Important contributions were made by scholars such as Devreesse and Vosté. In the research the relationship between these headings and the Psalms Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia received special attention. In 1960 Bloemendaal published an edition of these headings⁽¹⁾. He used the oldest manuscript containing the Eastern heading as the basic manuscript for his diplomatic edition. This is manuscript 6t1 according to the notation used for the Leiden edition of the Peshitta of the Old Testament⁽²⁾. Since the publication of Bloemendaal's dissertation not much has been published on these headings. However, since 1960 a number of important new manuscripts became available, as well as a translation of the commentary of Theodore and a translation of the commentary of Diodore on the first fifty Psalms⁽³⁾. This paper will deal with the light shed on the history of the East Syrian headings particularly by two manuscripts not available to Bloemendaal. Manuscript 12t4 contains at least four sets of headings for each Psalm, including the heading

(1) W. BLOEMENDAAL, *The Headings of the Psalms in the East Syrian Church* (Leiden 1960).

(2) Cf. PESHITTA INSTITUTE, *List of Old Testament Peshitta Manuscripts* (Preliminary Issue) (Leiden 1961). This notation will be used for the manuscripts studied in this article. In addition to the manuscripts, three editions containing the Psalms with Eastern headings are referred to as well. They are the following: ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY'S MISSION, *Mazmôrâ d'Dawîd*, Urmia, 1891 (Urmia Psalter = U^p); C.J. DAVID – G. EBED-JESUS-KHAYYAT (eds.), *Biblia Sacra juxta Versionem Simplicem quae dicitur Peshitta* (Mosul 1887-1891) (republished with correction of mistakes by J.-M. VOSTÉ, Beirut 1951) (= M); J. PERKINS, *K'tâbâ qaddîšâ hân(aw): d'diyatîqî 'attîqtâ sûryâ'îr w'pušâ d'men 'ebrâ'îr* (Urmia 1852) (reprint Trinitarian Bible Society; London 1954) (= U).

(3) R.C. HILL, *Diodore of Tarsus. Commentary on Psalms 1-51* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 9) (Atlanta, GA 2005), and *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Commentary on Psalms 1-81* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 5) (Atlanta, GA 2006).

ascribed to Theodore. The other important manuscript is 18>8dt1, a copy from the Eighteenth Century of a manuscript from the Eighth Century. The headings in this manuscript are the oldest from an Eastern manuscript, 6t1 being a Western manuscript. This manuscript is the only representative from the time between 6t1 and the Eastern manuscripts from the Twelfth Century and later. This paper discusses the headings in these two manuscripts, and their importance for the history of the Eastern headings.

I. History of research

The most complete discussion of the headings of the Psalms in the different manuscripts and editions of the Peshitta, as well as in a number of commentaries on the Psalms, is still Bloemendaal's. Bloemendaal distinguishes four groups of manuscripts or editions with regard to the headings⁽⁴⁾, which serve as useful starting point for the discussion:

- The headings of the East Syrian Church. These headings are the subject of this contribution.
- The headings of the West Syrian tradition, contained in the *codex ambrosianus*, and manuscripts following that tradition.
- The headings contained in editions such as those of Sionita, the Polyglots and Lee.
- Manuscripts with a mixture of headings, in some instances related to more than one of the first groups.

It is well known that the East Syrian titles are related to the important commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms⁽⁵⁾. Theodore rejected the headings of the Psalms in the Hebrew and the Greek. His influence was however so important not only in the East Syriac Church, but in all the Syriac speaking churches that the vast majority of Peshitta manuscripts of the Psalms do not reflect the titles of the Psalms in the Hebrew Bible. At the moment only two Peshitta manuscripts are known to have preserved something of the Hebrew titles. Manuscript 12t4 has already been referred to, with its Hebrew headings as one of the four sets of headings to each Psalm in

⁽⁴⁾ BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, 2-3.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. A. BAUMSTARK, *Geschichte des syrischen Literatur* (Bonn 1922) 102-104.

this manuscript⁽⁶⁾. The other manuscript preserving something of the headings of the Hebrew Bible is manuscript 12t3, which has the headings of the Syro-Hexapla, and not the normal East Syrian headings, as one would expect⁽⁷⁾.

It is impossible to present an extensive survey of the research on these headings, but a few important milestones merit attention.

In 1876 Nestle wrote a review of a book of Prager on the Peshitta⁽⁸⁾. Prager dealt with the Peshitta of the Old Testament as a whole, but he gave special attention to the headings of the Psalms⁽⁹⁾. It is quite evident that he used the edition of Lee for this study⁽¹⁰⁾. He referred to the double headings, such as those found in the edition of Lee, with one set referring to the life of David, while the other set referred to the *dogmata Christiana*. The first set was of Jewish origin and the second from Christian origin, according to Prager⁽¹¹⁾. The Jewish headings may have been changed or expanded to bring a Christian colouring to them, but the Jewish origin is certain⁽¹²⁾. The Christian headings are related to the *Pro titulis Psalmorum* of Eusebius⁽¹³⁾. Nestle pointed out that the headings used in the printed editions were late and that the manuscripts either did not have headings at all, or totally different headings than those in the printed editions. Nestle referred to manuscripts of the British Museum and pointed out that the headings were related to the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia⁽¹⁴⁾. Baethgen

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. H.F. VAN ROOY, "The 'Hebrew' Psalm Headings in the Syriac Manuscript 12t4" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25 (1999) 225-237.

⁽⁷⁾ Cf. H.F. VAN ROOY, "The Syro-Hexaplaric Headings of the Psalms in Manuscript 12t3", *Aramaic Studies* 3 (2005) 109-126.

⁽⁸⁾ E. NESTLE, "Review of Prager, J., *De veteris testamenti versione syriaca, quam Peschitto vocant, quaestiones criticae. Pars I*, Göttingen, 1875, Dieterichs Verlag", *ThLZ* 1 (1875) 281-284.

⁽⁹⁾ T. PRAGER, *De veteris Testamenti versione syriaca quam Peschitto vocant quaestiones criticae* (Göttingen 1875) 49-66.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Cf. especially PRAGER, *De Veteris Testamenti versione syriaca*, 50.

⁽¹¹⁾ PRAGER, *De Veteris Testamenti versione syriaca*, 50.

⁽¹²⁾ PRAGER, *De Veteris Testamenti versione syriaca*, 51.

⁽¹³⁾ PRAGER, *De Veteris Testamenti versione syriaca*, 51. These headings of Eusebius are then presented in an appendix, pp. 71-75.

⁽¹⁴⁾ NESTLE, "Prager", 281-282. In his discussion of manuscript 6t1 (British Library, additional manuscript 17110), W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS in the British Museum acquired after the year 1838* (London 1870) I, 116-117, already noted that the headings in this manuscript are different from those in the editions. This manuscript has a treatise on the headings as well, indicating that already at the time of its writing, the existence of different headings was well known. Cf. WRIGHT, *Catalogue British Museum* I, 118.

linked the origin of the Syriac headings in their different forms to Christian Fathers⁽¹⁵⁾. In 1885 Baethgen published an important study on a Syriac version of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms⁽¹⁶⁾. The beginning of the introduction to the commentary made it clear that it represents the exegesis of Theodore⁽¹⁷⁾. Theodore had written his commentary based on the text of the Septuagint, while this commentary was based on the Peshitta⁽¹⁸⁾. It contained sections based on the Peshitta where the Peshitta had disagreed with the Septuagint, making it clear that these sections could not have been written by Theodore. The commentary did, however, contain many sections going back directly to Theodore⁽¹⁹⁾.

In his discussion of this manuscript, Baethgen dealt extensively with the headings of the Psalms, which he regarded in many respects as the most interesting part of the commentary⁽²⁰⁾. In his commentary, Theodore had presented long introductions to each of the Psalms, giving a summary of his exegesis. The headings of the individual Psalms in the commentary in the manuscript Sachau 215 were summaries of these introductions of Theodore.

In the second quarter of the twentieth century the research on Theodore of Mopsuestia, his commentary on the Psalms and the headings of the Psalms in the Syriac traditions was dominated by two scholars, Vosté and Devreesse. Each of them published a number of studies that made a significant contribution to the research on these topics.

Devreesse published a number of preliminary studies⁽²¹⁾, but his

⁽¹⁵⁾ F. BAETHGEN, *Untersuchungen über die Psalmen nach der Peschitta* (Kiel 1878) 15. This view is repeated in his study on the text-critical importance of the ancient version of the Psalms; cf. F. BAETHGEN, "Der textkritische Werth den alten Uebersetzungen zu den Psalmen", *Jahrbuch für protestantische Theologie* 8 (1882) 424.

⁽¹⁶⁾ F. BAETHGEN, "Der Psalmencommentar des Theodorus von Mopsuestia in syrischer Bearbeitung", *ZAW* 5 (1885) 53-101.

⁽¹⁷⁾ BAETHGEN, "Psalmencommentar", 53.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. BAETHGEN, "Psalmencommentar", 56-60, for a detailed discussion of the data supporting this conclusion of Baethgen. For Theodore's view on the reliability of the Septuagint, cf. R.B. TER HAAR ROMENY, "The Peshitta and its Rivals. On the Assessment of the Peshitta and Other Versions of the Old Testament in Syriac Exegetical Literature", *The Harp* 11-12 (1998-1999) 21-23.

⁽¹⁹⁾ BAETHGEN, "Psalmencommentar", 63.

⁽²⁰⁾ BAETHGEN, "Psalmencommentar", 65.

⁽²¹⁾ R. DEVREESSE, "Le Commentaire de Theodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes", *RB* 37 (1928) 340-366; "Le Commentaire de Theodore de Mopsueste

research culminated in two large publications: an edition of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms in 1939 and an extensive essay on Theodore, published in 1948⁽²²⁾.

In an article published in 1930, Devreesse attended to the question of the sources for the reconstruction of the commentaries of Theodore⁽²³⁾. In this article he responded to an article of Vosté published in two instalments in 1929⁽²⁴⁾. For this study Vosté's section on the Psalms is especially important⁽²⁵⁾. He began by referring to the well-known statement of Leontius of Byzantium that Theodore had rejected the headings of the Psalms and that he had linked the interpretation of the Psalms to the Jews, especially Zerubbabel and Hezekiah and he connected only three Psalms to Christ⁽²⁶⁾.

In 1939 Devreesse published a very important edition of the commentary of Theodore on the Psalms⁽²⁷⁾. This was an attempt to reconstruct Psalms 1-80 from various sources. This publication of the commentary was very important for the study of the headings in the East Syriac tradition. Theodore had had a summary of his exegesis as an introduction to the commentary on each Psalm. The East Syriac headings had on these introductions been based. This edition contained only Psalm 1-80.

In his extensive work on the works and approach of Theodore, Devreesse discussed the commentary on the Psalms in detail⁽²⁸⁾. Most of the Psalms had been linked to historical circumstances in the life of David or the people of the Old Testament, such as the time of Hezekiah and the siege of Jerusalem, the Babylonian exile or the era of the Maccabees⁽²⁹⁾. He regarded David as the author of all the

sur les Psaumes (*Suite*)", *RB* 38 (1929) 35-62 and "Par quelles voies nous sont parvenus les Commentaires de Théodore de Mopsueste?", *RB* 39 (1930) 362-377.

⁽²²⁾ R. DEVREESSE, *Le Commentaire de Theodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes 1-80* (Studi e Testi 93; Rome 1939) and *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e Testi 141; Rome 1948).

⁽²³⁾ DEVREESSE, "Par quelle voies", 362-377.

⁽²⁴⁾ J.M. VOSTÉ, "L'oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste au II^e Concile de Constantinople", *RB* 38 (1929) 382-395 and "L'oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste au II^e Concile de Constantinople (*Fin*)", *RB* 38 (1929) 542-554.

⁽²⁵⁾ VOSTÉ, "L'oeuvre exégétique (*Fin*)", 542-553.

⁽²⁶⁾ VOSTÉ, "L'oeuvre exégétique (*Fin*)", 542.

⁽²⁷⁾ DEVREESSE, *Commentaire*.

⁽²⁸⁾ DEVREESSE, *Essai*.

⁽²⁹⁾ DEVREESSE, *Essai*, 69-70.

Psalms, inspired by the Spirit, to instruct and teach the people of God⁽³⁰⁾. David thus had a prophetic task, but his prophetic vision had not extended past the time of the Maccabees, with the exception of the four Psalms which Theodore regarded as messianic⁽³¹⁾.

In 1942 Vosté published an article, dealing especially with Theodore's work on the Psalms⁽³²⁾. After listing important studies on and editions of the work of Theodore, he mentioned the publication of Devreesse of Theodore's commentary on Psalm 1-80⁽³³⁾. He then discussed this publication, and the sources used, in more detail⁽³⁴⁾.

In another article published in 1944, Vosté discussed the headings of the Psalms in the Peshitta according to the eastern recension⁽³⁵⁾. He distinguished two traditions, the western or Jacobite and the eastern or Nestorian. The latter were derived from Theodore⁽³⁶⁾. The western tradition was not as fixed as the eastern. In the eastern headings synonyms did appear, but rarely, while abbreviation is more common. The tradition was, however, quite fixed and related to the exegesis of Theodore⁽³⁷⁾. Taking everything in consideration, Vosté concluded that the origin of the East Syrian headings may be dated in the sixth, or even the fifth, century⁽³⁸⁾.

In 1960 Bloemendaal published his edition of the headings of the East Syrian Church, the most important and extensive work on the East Syrian headings to date⁽³⁹⁾. Bloemendaal accepted the view expressed by Vosté, viz., that the East Syriac headings did not really show many differences. Differences are restricted to the use of synonyms (rarely) and abbreviations. The latter did not, however, affect the sense of the headings⁽⁴⁰⁾.

⁽³⁰⁾ DEVREESSE, *Essai*, 70-71.

⁽³¹⁾ Cf. DEVREESSE, *Essai*, 72-77, for a discussion of the way in which the Psalms were used in the New Testament.

⁽³²⁾ J.M. VOSTÉ, "Théodore de Mopsuestia sur les Psaumes", *Angelicum* 29 (1942) 179-198.

⁽³³⁾ VOSTÉ, "Théodore de Mopsuestia", 179-180.

⁽³⁴⁾ VOSTÉ, "Théodore de Mopsuestia", 181-188. He concludes this discussion with a list of corrections to the edition, on pages 186-188.

⁽³⁵⁾ J.M. VOSTÉ, "Sur les titres des psaumes dans le Pešitta, surtout d'après la recension orientale", *Bib* 25 (1944) 210-235.

⁽³⁶⁾ VOSTÉ, "Sur les titres des Psaumes", 211.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. VOSTÉ, "Sur les titres des Psaumes", 212-216, especially 214.

⁽³⁸⁾ VOSTÉ, "Sur les titres des Psaumes", 234-235.

⁽³⁹⁾ BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, 12.

In a short section Bloemendaal dealt with what he calls the Nestorian headings through the years⁽⁴¹⁾. He again agreed with the view of Vosté that these headings had not changed much through the years. The starting point remained the same: the exegesis of Theodore. Bloemendaal regarded 6t1 as the paradigmatic manuscript with respect to the headings. In only three instances did headings occur that are not in agreement with Theodore's exegesis, viz., in Psalm 74 in 13t2, and in Psalm 113 and 114 in Mingana 428, where Western influence was discerned⁽⁴²⁾.

In the period after the publication of the work of Bloemendaal, the stream of publications on the exegesis of Theodore on the Psalms and the headings of the East Syrian church almost dried up. It was more than a decade before new publications started to appear, especially linked to the publication of new editions of Syriac commentaries on the Psalms, such as the commentaries of Athanasius and Iṣḥōdādh. Instead, a number of studies appeared that dealt with aspects of the theology of Theodore and Antiochene exegesis.

After a preliminary report in 1978⁽⁴³⁾, Van Rompay published the remaining fragments of the Syriac version of the Commentary of Theodore on the Psalms in 1982⁽⁴⁴⁾. This was a very important development in the study of Theodore, his interpretation of the Psalms and his influence on the interpretation of the Psalms in the Syriac tradition. In the introduction to his translation Van Rompay offered an extensive discussion of the manuscript⁽⁴⁵⁾, as well as of the origin of these fragments and their relation to the work of Theodore. He stated that there was no doubt that Theodore had written a commentary on the Psalms. Theodore himself had regarded it the most important of all his works⁽⁴⁶⁾.

⁽⁴¹⁾ BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, 20-21.

⁽⁴²⁾ BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, 21-22.

⁽⁴³⁾ Cf. L. VAN ROMPAY, "Fragments syriaques du Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes", *OLP* 9 (1978) 83-93.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ L. VAN ROMPAY, *Théodore de Mopsueste. Fragments syriaques du Commentaire des Psaumes (Psaumes 118 et Psaumes 138-149)* (CSCO 435 *Scriptores Syri* 189; Leuven 1982) (containing the Syriac text); and *Théodore de Mopsueste. Fragments syriaques du Commentaire des Psaumes (Psaumes 118 et Psaumes 138-149)* (CSCO 436 *Scriptores Syri* 190; Leuven 1982) (containing a French translation).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ VAN ROMPAY, *Théodore de Mopsueste* (Translation) X-XVII. The fragments of the Psalms are on folio 176v-218v.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ VAN ROMPAY, *Théodore de Mopsueste* (Translation) V.

II. The manuscripts

In this paper three manuscripts are used in particular, and they are described below.

- Manuscript 6t1: London, British Library Additional Manuscript 17,110

This manuscript dates from not later than AD 600. The manuscript is almost complete, lacking Psalm 95, inscription, to 97:11 and 119:88-132⁽⁴⁷⁾. This manuscript was used as the basic text for Bloemendaal's diplomatic edition of the headings⁽⁴⁸⁾.

- Manuscript 18<8dt1: Manchester: John Rylands Library, Rylands Syriac Manuscript 4

This manuscript dates from AD 1727, and was copied from an earlier manuscript, now lost⁽⁴⁹⁾. It was given the number 18<13dt1 in the original list at Leiden⁽⁵⁰⁾, but that has now been changed to 18<8dt1, meaning that the original manuscript copied was from the Eighth Century, and not the Thirteenth Century, as earlier thought⁽⁵¹⁾. A complete description of this manuscript is given by Coakley⁽⁵²⁾.

- Manuscript 12t4: Baghdad, Library of the Chaldean Patriarchate, Manuscript 1113, folios 11^a-118^b (formerly Mossoul, Library of the Chaldean Patriarchate, Manuscript 1113)

This manuscript dates from the Twelfth Century. This is the most important Eastern text used for the critical edition of the Psalms⁽⁵³⁾. This manuscript has been discussed in detail before⁽⁵⁴⁾. The first description of this manuscript was published by Scher in 1908⁽⁵⁵⁾.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. D.M. WALTER, *The Book of Psalms* (The Old Testament in Syriac II 3; Leiden 1980) VIII.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf. BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, 13.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf. Peshitta Institute, *List*, 27.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Cf. WALTER, *Psalms*, XXIX.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Cf. J.F. COAKLEY, "A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library", *BJRL* 75 (1993) 122, n. 39.

⁽⁵²⁾ COAKLEY, "Catalogue", 120-123.

⁽⁵³⁾ Cf. WALTER, *Psalms*, XXVII.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Cf. H.F. VAN ROOY, *Studies on the Syriac Apocryphal Psalms* (Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement 7; Oxford 1999) 11-26.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ A. SCHER, "Notice sur les manuscrits Syriaques et arabica conservés à l'archevêché Chaldéen de Diarbékir" *Journal Asiatique* X/X (1907) 331-362.385-431.

The information given by Scher was not used for the list published by the Peshitta Institute in Leiden. According to Scher the Psalms were preceded by five introductions to the Psalms (Hyppolyte, Basil, Eusebius, Athanasius and Origen)⁽⁵⁶⁾. The Psalms, Apocryphal Psalms and Odes were followed by hymns and other texts. Scher mentions that each Psalm has the headings of Eusebius, Athanasius and Theodore, but he does not mention the “Hebrew” headings⁽⁵⁷⁾.

1. *The headings in 6t1, 18>8dt1 and 12t4*

In the following discussion important variants related to the three manuscripts will be described briefly. Variants of minor importance, such as related to orthography, the relative or different constructions for the genitive (with or without pronominal suffix followed by the relative), errors and the use of *seyame*, will be disregarded. We will start the discussion with a few examples to demonstrate the variety that does occur in some instances.

Psalm 64 is an example of an original short heading that remained short throughout the history:

אמרו לבית דוד אלהים נחם

Spoken by David when he was pursued by Saul.

Psalm 67 is an example of a Psalm with a number of shorter alternatives. In the example the basic headings are given, without the minor variants:

6t1, 18>8dt1, 12t4, and others

אמרו לבית דוד אלהים נחם
אמרו לבית דוד אלהים נחם
אמרו לבית דוד אלהים נחם
אמרו לבית דוד אלהים נחם

He prophesies about the return of the people and teaches the priests that it would then be more and more proper for them to use words of blessings as divine command when they return to their place.

13t3

אמרו לבית דוד אלהים נחם

He prophesies about the return of the people and teaches words of blessings.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ SCHER, “Notice”, 346.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Cf. VAN ROOY, *Apocryphal Psalms*, 21-25.

M428

הַעֲבֹדָה בַּפִּיטָה הַזֹּאת.

He prophesies about the return of the people.

M

הַעֲבֹדָה בַּפִּיטָה הַזֹּאת לְחֹמֶר הַנִּשְׁמָע
בְּחֹלֶה הַנִּשְׁמָע וְהַנִּשְׁמָע לְחֹמֶר.

He prophesies about the return and teaches the priests to use words of blessings when they return to their place.

Psalms 115 is a good example of the range of variation that is found sometimes. It is given below, again without all the minor variants in all the manuscripts used:

6t1, 18>8dt1, 12t1, 12t4, 13t1, 13t2, 13t4, 17t2, M25, M

וְכָבֹד בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לֵאמֹר הָאֵל הַגָּבֹהּ הַמִּשְׁתַּבַּח
לְחֹמֶר בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לְחֹמֶר.
וְכָבֹד בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לְחֹמֶר הַנִּשְׁמָע.

He points out the things that were done to the people in Babylon and they praised God about their return. Spoken in the person of Hezekiah when he was sick about what was taken away.

16t2, 17t1, M507

וְכָבֹד בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לֵאמֹר הָאֵל הַגָּבֹהּ הַמִּשְׁתַּבַּח
לְחֹמֶר בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לְחֹמֶר.

He points out the things that were done to the people in Babylon and they praised God about their return.

U, U^p

וְכָבֹד בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לֵאמֹר הָאֵל הַגָּבֹהּ הַמִּשְׁתַּבַּח
בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לְחֹמֶר הַנִּשְׁמָע.

He points out the calamities that were done to the people in Babylon. And spoken also about Hezekiah when he was sick about what was taken away.

13t3

וְכָבֹד בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לֵאמֹר הָאֵל הַגָּבֹהּ הַמִּשְׁתַּבַּח

He points out the calamities that were done to the people in Babylon.

M428

אֲחֵרֵי בַּאֲלֵהֶם הַשְׁמָעִי לְחֹמֶר הַנִּשְׁמָע.

Spoken about Hezekiah when he was sick about what was taken away.

17t3

ܠ ܐܪܡܝܐ ܕܐܫܬܪܝܐ ܠܗܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܠ. ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܦܝܐ
 ܦܪܥܝܐ ܠܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ ܐܦ ܠ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ
 ܠ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ

About the calamities that were done to the people in Babylon and they praised God on account of their return. And spoken about Hezekiah when he was sick about what was taken away.

In this instance the heading in the oldest and most important manuscripts reflect a double historical situation. Some of the other manuscripts have the one historical situation, and others the other situation, with a considerable amount of variety. A younger manuscript like 17t3 has both the situations, but with a different formulation.

In the following sections a number of important variants in 6t1, 18>8dt1 and 12t4 will be discussed in different groups.

2. Longer reading in 6t1 supported by 18>8dt1 and 12t4

In many instances 6t1 has a longer reading than some of the younger manuscripts, especially 13t3, M428 and M. In most of these instances this reading is supported by 18>8dt1 and/or 12t4. Examples of this occur in many Psalms, such as Psalm 2, 9, 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, 29, 30, 32, 33, and many more.

Psalm 2 is a typical example. 6t1 and 12t4 have the following heading:

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ ܕܐܫܬܪܝܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܠ
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܦܝܐ ܠܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ

He prophesies about the things that were to be done by the Jews during the Passion of our Lord and he reminds us of his human nature as well.

M428 and M have:

ܡܠܟܐ ܕܐܪܡܝܐ ܕܐܫܬܪܝܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܒܒܠ

He prophesies about everything that was done by the Jews during the Passion of our Lord.

(M428 omits the last two words in the Syriac as well).

The difference between the two headings is very typical of this kind of variant, with the longer heading consisting of more than one phrase, while only the first phrase is retained in the shorter heading. Such variants led Vosté, followed by Bloemendaal, to conclude that the main variants in the East Syriac headings are shortened versions

of the original heading. This kind of variant occurs frequently, but it is not the only kind of variant. There are about 30 Psalms where the headings remained fairly consistent in all the manuscripts⁽⁵⁸⁾. In the instances where shorter headings can be found, the shorter headings are in most instances restricted to a number of manuscripts. There are 44 instances where the shorter heading occur in 13t3 and M428, in some instances with one or a few other manuscripts having shorter headings as well. In 31 instances the shorter heading occurs in 13t3, with some other manuscripts in some instances, but without M428. In 25 instances shorter headings occur in M428, and some other manuscripts, but not in 13t3. Although these shorter headings are important, the fact that they are restricted to just a small number of manuscripts, make them of less importance than some of the other possibilities discussed below.

3. *Longer reading in 6t1, with shorter reading supported by 18>8dt1 and 12t4*

There are a few headings where 6t1 has a longer reading than the majority of manuscripts, with the shorter reading supported by 18>8dt1 and 12t4. In Psalm 10, only 6t1 and 13t1 have לַעֲבֹד at the beginning of the heading. In Psalm 61, 6t1 adds וְיִשְׁמַע (to receive) after לַעֲבֹד, with 13t1 and 13t4 (He declares about the things done to the people in Babylon and how they asked help).

Psalm 104 is a very interesting example. 6t1 has a slightly longer reading than the majority of manuscripts, with 16t2 and 17t1:

וְיִשְׁמַע בְּהַלְלוֹתָי וְיִשְׁמַע בְּהַלְלוֹתָי
וְיִשְׁמַע בְּהַלְלוֹתָי וְיִשְׁמַע בְּהַלְלוֹתָי
וְיִשְׁמַע בְּהַלְלוֹתָי וְיִשְׁמַע בְּהַלְלוֹתָי

He narrates the greatness of the help of God from the variety of his work and he makes known that every one of his creatures was admirably formed by him.

18>8dt1 and 12t4 (with 13t1, 13t2, 13t4, 17t2, 17t3, M25, M507 U, U^p, M) do not have the reference to “help”.

From Psalm 119-133, only 6t1 has לַעֲבֹד at the beginning of the heading. This refers to the “Songs of Ascents” of the Hebrew, retained by the Septuagint.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ For the discussion of the variants in the headings, the information was taken from BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, with the information of 12t4 and 18>8dt1 added to that.

In these instances, where the shorter heading is found in 12t4 and 18>8dt1, the shorter heading can not be regarded as a late variant, but must be evaluated in its own right. In these instances, the shorter heading may be more original than the heading of 6t1.

4. *6t1 has the same information as the other manuscripts, but with a different construction*

In some instances 6t1 has a unique reading, with the same basic information as the other headings, but phrased in a different way. Psalm 11 is a good example, where 6t1 has:

בִּנְיָאֵלֶיךָ הָיָה כִּי יָצִיחַ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ לֹא יִחְלָצֶנּוּ
לְחַיֵּיךָ כִּי מִגִּבְרֹתֶיךָ

When David was pursued by Saul and those who were with him counselled him to flee before him.

18>8dt1, 12t4 and the majority of the manuscripts have:

אֲחֵי לֵוִי בִּנְיָאֵלֶיךָ כִּי יָצִיחַ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ לֹא יִחְלָצֶנּוּ
יִחְלָצֶנּוּ לְחַיֵּיךָ כִּי מִגִּבְרֹתֶיךָ

Spoken by David when David was pursued by Saul and those who were with him counselled him to flee before him.

13t3, M428 and M have a much shorter reading than the majority, while only 6t1 of the majority omits the **לֵוִי לֵוִי** at the beginning.

Psalm 42 has two examples where 6t1 had a different construction with the same content as the other manuscripts. It has **לֵוִי לֵוִי** for **לֵוִי לֵוִי** in the other manuscripts, and **לֵוִי לֵוִי** for **לֵוִי לֵוִי** (In the person of the people in Babylon spoken by David, the things that were fit for them to say in the time of the exile).

The heading of Psalm 51 in 6t1 begins with **לֵוִי לֵוִי** (admonition about), while the others start with **לֵוִי לֵוִי** (he prophesies about). At the end of Psalm 55, 6t1 has **לֵוִי לֵוִי** (their fraud) for the **לֵוִי לֵוִי** (their greed) in the other manuscripts (Spoken in the person of Onias, who admitted to God the treason of his kinsmen towards him and the evil that was done by the people on account of their greed).

In Psalm 74, 6t1 has the verb **לֵוִי לֵוִי** for **לֵוִי לֵוִי** in the other witnesses (He points to the greatness of the calamities of the Maccabees when they narrated the evil that surrounded them and they asked from God deliverance from them).

In Psalm 77, 6t1, as well as 13t2, has **לְעֹשֵׂי רָעָם** (oppressions) for **לְעֹשֵׂי רָעָם** (oppressors) in the other manuscripts.

In Psalm 84, 6t1 and 12t4 have **מֵבִינֵי בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** for **לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** of the other manuscripts (He makes known about the return of the people and that they eagerly observed the place of the temple after their return and they remembered the former things and marvelled at them).

In Psalm 94, the majority of manuscripts read in the middle of the heading **נִבְּאָה לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (He prophesies about the people in Babylon who told their sufferings which they experienced during the time of their captivity). 18>8dt1, together with 13t1 and 13t4, has **נִבְּאָה לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, while only 6t1 has **לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (and narrated about). The reading of 18>8dt1 is problematic, because of the change of subject.

At the beginning of Psalm 124, 6t1 has **לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (the **ל** before **נִבְּאָה** has been left out in error), while the other manuscripts have **נִבְּאָה לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** (He prophesies about the acquittal of the people by God after their return, that they prevailed over their enemies in their surroundings when they assembled against them).

In these instances the heading of 6t1 should not necessarily be taken as closer to the original.

5. 6t1 has a variant that situates the Psalm differently

In Psalm 20, 6t1 has the verb **יִפְדֶּה** (to be delivered), while the other manuscripts have **יִצְטָר** (to be tormented).

The heading of Psalm 41 refers to the sickness (**מַחֲמָה**) of Hezekiah in 6t1. This is the reading of the majority of the witnesses as well. However, 18>8dt1, 12t1, 12t4 and M25 refer to his affliction (**מַחֲמָה**). In the commentary of Theodore reference is made to his illness in this Psalm⁽⁵⁹⁾, making it possible that 6t1 retained the original heading.

Psalm 46 is one of the instances where 6t1 goes its own way, with the following heading:

**לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְלְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**

About Hezekiah and those of the house of Judah who were delivered from the Damascenes and from those of the house of Ephraim.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Cf. HILL, *Theodore*, 506-509.

With a few minor variations, the following headings occur in the majority of the other witnesses:

בְּאֶחָז וּבְאֵלֵי הַבֵּית הַזֶּה הָיָה הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּה
הַבְּנֵי אֶחָז

About Ahaz and those of the house of Hezekiah that were delivered from the Damascenes and from those of the house of Ephraim.

In this instance the introduction of Theodore to this Psalm refers to Ahaz, and not to Hezekiah at all. In the commentary on this Psalm no reference is made to Hezekiah as well⁽⁶⁰⁾.

6. 6t1 has a shorter heading than the other manuscripts

In Psalm 20, 6t1 starts with אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ while the other manuscripts have אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ. In Psalm 41, 6t1 omits אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ. In Psalm 44, 6t1 does not have the phrase אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ at the end of the heading (Request of the Maccabees when they were compelled by Antiochus to sacrifice to the idols). This is the case in the edition from Mosul as well.

In Psalm 68, 6t1 omits the word “the Gattite”, as do 12t1, 13t1, 13t2, 13t3 and 13t4 (Spoken by David when he brought the ark of the Lord up from the house of Obed Edom the Gattite and he was dancing before it and he was jumping while he was using the words of Moses and Joshua when they were telling the miracles that were done in their days).

In Psalm 82, 6t1, 18>8dt1 and 12t4 (with some other witnesses as well) have a much shorter heading than a number of younger witnesses:

6t1, 18>8dt1, 12t4, 13t1, 13t2, 13t3, 17t1, 17t3, U, U^p

הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּה הָיָה הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּה
הַמַּלְאָכִים.

He condemns the rulers of the people that with partiality they acquitted those who did wrong.

16t2, 17t2, M25, M507, M have, without the minor variants:

אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ אֲלֵלֵּיָּהּ הָיָה הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּה
הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּה הָיָה הַמַּלְאָכִים הַזֵּה

Spoken by David when he condemned the rulers of the people, that with partiality they acquitted those who did wrong when the prophet accused them.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Cf. HILL, *Theodore*, 600-613.

At the beginning of the heading of Psalm 99, 6t1 and 18>8dt1 omit **כִּלְכִּל**.

Psalm 108 is an example where 6t1, 18>8dt1 and 12t4, with other manuscripts, have a shorter heading than many younger manuscripts:

6t1, 18>8dt1, 12t4, 13t2, 13t3, 13t4, 16t2, 17t1, 17t3, M428, U, U^p

וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה

Thanksgiving of the Maccabees on account of their victory.

17t2, M25, M507, M

**וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה
וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה**

Thanksgiving of the Maccabees on account of their victory when they prevailed over their enemies.

6t1 omits the **כִּלְכִּל** at the beginning of the heading of Psalm 110 (He prophesies about the dispensation of our Saviour the Messiah).

In Psalm 110, 6t1, 18>8dt1, 12t4 and the majority of manuscripts have a shorter heading than some late witnesses:

6t1, 18>8dt1, 12t4, 13t1, 13t2, 13t3, 13t4, 16t2, 17t1, 17t2, 17t3, M25, M428, M507, M

וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה

He prophesies about the dispensation of our Saviour the Messiah.

U, U^p

**וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה
וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה**

He prophesies about the dispensation of our Saviour the Messiah and he also makes known to us about the distinction of the natures.

In Psalm 126, 6t1 has the following heading:

**וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה
וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה כִּי הוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה**

Spoken in the person of the people after their return when their enemies impeded them.

18>8dt1 and 12t4 add **וְהוֹדוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לַיהוָה** to this (as do 13t1, 13t2, 13t3, 13t4, 17t1 and 17t3).

17t2, M25, U, U^p, M have a much expanded heading:

אֲחֵינוּ לִנְסֹא: הָיָה חֵסֶד וְחֶסֶד בְּיָמֵינוּ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
 לִמֵּן כְּלֵי־מִלְחָמָה: הָיָה חֵסֶד וְחֶסֶד בְּיָמֵינוּ הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה
 הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה.

Spoken by David in the person of the people after their return when their enemies impeded them from the building of the temple through the hands of Zerubbabel from the tribe of Judah.

This is a very important example. The additional phrase occurring in 12t4, 18>8dt1 and a number of other manuscripts make perfect sense. The omission in 6t1 makes the exact context of the heading unclear. In this instance the shortened heading of 6t1 must be an early revision of the slightly longer original heading.

In Psalm 128, 6t1 omits the last two words (וְיָדַעְתָּ; He prophesies about the return of the people and he teaches them to remember the former things and to acknowledge their prosperity). This is omitted by the edition from Mosul as well, though it has a shortened version of the heading.

In Psalm 137, some of the younger witnesses (17t2, M25, M507, M) add “God” after the verb “to praise” (He points out about the return of the people in Babylon and how they praised on account of their salvation).

At the end of the heading of Psalm 146, 18>8dt1 and 12t4 add וְיָדַעְתָּ, as do 13t1, 13t4, 16t2, 17t1, 17t3 and M25 (He prophesies about the people in Babylon and he praises in their person about the things done for them by God).

In Psalm 105, 6t1 omits the final word (וְיָדַעְתָּ). This is a scribal error, at the end of a line, where the noun was omitted that should have followed the preposition “to” (He instructs the people about virtue and he teaches them to praise God when he mentions to them the former favours that were done by him to their fathers). It omits the “them” after “he teaches” as well.

These examples go against the view of Bloemendaal and Vosté that original longer headings were shortened by later manuscripts. One must remember that many of the headings were quite short, in 6t1 and all the other witnesses, such as Psalm 22, 25 and 27. It may be quite possible that in some instances 6t1 has an expanded heading, with the shorter heading being original.

7. 18>8dt1 and 12t4 have minuses, plusses or variants

In a number of instances, 18>8dt1 or 12t4 has unique variants. This is especially true of 12t4.

In Psalm 28, 12t4 omits לְהַלְלֶנּוּ. In Psalm 43, 12t4 has לְהַלְלֶנּוּ for לְהַלְלֶנּוּ וְלֵאמֹר לֵאלֹהֵינוּ in the other manuscripts⁽⁶¹⁾. In Psalm 55, 12t4 omits לְהַלְלֶנּוּ. In Psalm 60, 12t4 omits לְהַלְלֶנּוּ (He prophesies about the house of the Maccabees when they faithfully asked for mercy). In Psalm 69, 12t4 omits לְהַלְלֶנּוּ (in the battles) (He tells in the person of the Maccabees of the greatness of their calamities in the battles and of the plots from the side of their kinsmen and that they longed for vengeance on them). In Psalm 70, 12t4 has Saul in the place of Absalom (Prayer of David when he was in the calamities that Absalom inflicted upon him).

In Psalm 75, 12t4 has, with 16t2 and 17t1, לְהַלְלֶנּוּ וְלֵאמֹר לֵאלֹהֵינוּ (after the death of the Assyrians), where the other manuscripts only have a reference to the Assyrians. In Psalm 77, 12t4 has לְהַלְלֶנּוּ וְלֵאמֹר לֵאלֹהֵינוּ (with 16t2 and 17t1) for לְהַלְלֶנּוּ in the other manuscripts (He narrates in the person of the people that those dishonourable things were thought against God in their captivity when they were compelled by their oppressors).

In Psalm 84, 12t4 has לְהַלְלֶנּוּ (with 16t2, 17t2 and M507) for לְהַלְלֶנּוּ. In Psalm 87, only 12t4 has לְהַלְלֶנּוּ for the לְהַלְלֶנּוּ in the other manuscripts (He shows the salvation of Jerusalem after the Assyrians have taken the ten tribes into captivity and then came against her as well to destroy her and they received punishment). In Psalm 91, it adds לְהַלְלֶנּוּ (blessed) before David.

In Psalm 100, 12t4 (with 13t4) has לְהַלְלֶנּוּ for לְהַלְלֶנּוּ at the end of the heading (He advises the people that they have to enter the temple like men who have returned from captivity and to praise God on account of the wondrous things he has done to them). In Psalm 101, 12t4 omits לְהַלְלֶנּוּ (Spoken in the person of the outstanding men among the people in Babylon during the time of their adversities).

In Psalm 117, 12t4 has לְהַלְלֶנּוּ וְלֵאמֹר לֵאלֹהֵינוּ for לְהַלְלֶנּוּ at the end of the heading (Thanksgiving of the people on account of their victory after their return, when peoples in their surroundings assembled against them and they subdued them).

In Psalm 125, 12t4 has a different word order for the phrase “a return from God” (About the people in Babylon who asked a return from God and who promised what they will do if they were to be delivered).

⁽⁶¹⁾ Cf. the heading in the commentary of Bar Hebraeus, BLOEMENDAAL, *Headings*, 51.

In Psalm 131, the majority of the manuscripts have **לְבַרְכּוֹ** at the beginning of the heading. 12t4 has **לְבַרְכּוֹ מִן** (He prophesies about the people in Babylon when they reminded God of the love of David for him and they asked mercy from him on account of his promises to him).

At the end of the heading of Psalm 136, 12t4 adds **וְכִבְּדוֹ**, with 17t3, U, U^p and M (He prophesies about the people in Babylon when they narrated their adversities).

In Psalm 122, 18>8dt1 has a different word order for the phrase “in faith from God”, namely “from God in faith” (How the people asked patiently in faith from God to return them from Babylon).

18>8dt1 and 12t4 have a number of additions, in some instances unique. In Psalm 3, 12t4 adds “his son” to “Absalom”. In Psalm 55, 12t4 adds **לְבַרְכּוֹ** after **לְבַרְכּוֹ**, with the majority of the younger manuscripts. In Psalm 86, 12t4 has a unique reading, inserting **וְכִבְּדוֹ** before **וְכִבְּדוֹ** (Prayer of Hezekiah when the Assyrians surrounded him and he asked from God deliverance from them).

III. Discussion and conclusions

It is quite clear from the examples discussed that in many instances 6t1, supported by 18>8dt1 and 12t4, has a longer reading than some of the younger manuscripts, and especially 13t3, M428 and M. It is this kind of heading that lead Vosté to conclude that the main variants in the headings are shortened versions of the original heading. Because these shorter headings occur in only a few of the manuscripts, one must not use this phenomenon to make conclusions about a general trend.

There are a number of examples where 6t1 (supported by one or two younger manuscripts) has a slightly longer heading than most of the other manuscripts, such as in Psalm 10, 16 and 104. The longer heading in these instances have just one word more than the more general heading. This may reflect a change from the original heading in 6t1, with 18>8dt1 and 12t4 reflecting the more original heading. The same is probably true of those instances where the heading in 6t1 has the same information as the other manuscripts, but phrased in a slightly different way. Psalm 11 is a good example in this regard.

In three instances 6t1 has a different heading than the other manuscripts, with a slightly different setting. The heading of Psalm 20 is as follows:

5. የግልጽ ምርመራ ማድረግ፣

18>8dt1, 12t1, 12t4, 13t1, 13t2, 13t4, 16t2, 17t1, 17t2, 17t3, M25, M428, U, U^p, M

ה'תשנ"ח

In this instance 6t1 has no support from any manuscript. The same is true of the variant in Psalm 46. In this instance the commentary of Theodore had no reference to Hezekiah, as discussed above. In Psalm 41, 6t1 has a reading occurring in other manuscripts as well, but not in 18>8dt1 and 12t4. In these instances 6t1 probably reflects an early revision of the heading as well.

Psalm 126 is an interesting example. Some younger witnesses have a much longer heading. A somewhat shorter heading occurs in the majority of manuscripts. 6t1 has a shortened heading, omitting the phrase “from building the temple”. This phrase occurs in 12t4, 13t1, 13t2, 13t3, 13t4, 17t1, 17t3, 18>8dt1. In this instance 18>8dt1 and 12t4 probably have the original heading, with 6t1 having an early revision, and the younger witnesses a much later revision, as discussed above. The same is true of Psalm 146.

(⁶²) HILL, *Theodore*, 538-539.

quite a number of variants, sometimes supported by other manuscripts. This testifies to the probability that 12t4 is much closer to the original than both 6t1 and 12t4.

The examples discussed lead one to the conclusion that 6t1 must not be regarded as the paradigmatic witness in all instances. Where 6t1 is supported by both 12t4 and 18>8dt1, the reading can be regarded as at least close to the original. When 18>8dt1 supports 6t1, and 12t4 has variants, the reading of 6t1 and 18>8dt1 can be regarded as closer to the original. When 12t4 and 18>8dt1 have a different reading than 6t1, the heading of these two manuscripts are probably more original.

North-West University
Potchefstroom
South Africa

H.F. VAN ROOY

SUMMARY

In the first half of the previous century the headings of the Psalms in the East Syriac tradition received a lot of attention, with important contributions by scholars such as Devreesse and Vosté. In 1960 Bloemendaal published an edition of these headings. Since 1960 a number of important new manuscripts became available, as well as a translation of the commentary of Theodore and a translation of the commentary of Diodore on the first fifty Psalms. This paper deals with the light shed on the history of the East Syrian headings particularly by two manuscripts not available to Bloemendaal. The examples discussed lead one to the conclusion that 6t1, used by Bloemendaal, must not be regarded as the paradigmatic witness in all instances.

“Dematerializing” Religion: Reading John 2–4 as a Chiasm

The structural arrangement of John 2–4 has been variously understood from a simple geographical movement to more complex parallelisms of different kinds. While it might be safe to say that the majority of current Johannine scholars ascribes to the literary unity of these three chapters, no proposal for their particular structure has received the honor of holding the consensus. This lack of agreement goes hand in hand with a gap in thorough discussions of existing proposals. The prologue, the farewell discourse, the signs and various literary devices and symbols have preoccupied students of the Gospel at length. But a monograph about the literary coherence and structure of the Gospel’s opening chapters after the prologue has yet to appear. This article probes into the area first by a critical investigation of Moloney’s sequential reading of the text, followed by a suggested chiasmic structure that incorporates many strengths of common, scattered, and possibly new observations alike⁽¹⁾.

I. Synthetic Parallelism: Moloney’s proposal for John 2–4

1. *Moloney’s Structure of John 2–4*

In his essay from 1978 as well as in his commentary on the Gospel of John twenty years later Francis Moloney argued for a Cana-to-Cana cycle in John 2–4. He further identifies the uniting thread of the texts as “radical openness to the word of Jesus as a criterion of true faith”⁽²⁾ as the author leads “the reader through a

⁽¹⁾ English quotations from the Gospel of John have been taken from the *New American Standard Version* unless otherwise noted.

⁽²⁾ F.J. MOLONEY, “From Cana to Cana (John 2,1–4,54)”, *Studia Biblica* 2 (ed. E.A. LIVINGSTONE) (JSNTSupp. 2; Sheffield 1979) 192; *Women First Among the Faithful* (Notre Dame, IN 1986) 97–100; *The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina 4; Collegeville, MN 1998) 148, 156–157 (sum); also 68–69 (Mary and complete faith), 79–80 (Jews and unbelief); 97 (Nicodemus and partial belief, also pp. 91–93), 107 (John the Baptist and authentic belief), 118–119 (Samaritan woman and unbelief), 127 (Samaritan woman and partial belief), 148 (Samaritans and authentic belief).

series of examples of faith”⁽³⁾. Moloney lines up Jesus’ different dialogues and miracles as Jewish (2,12–3,36) and non-Jewish (4,1–42) journeys from “no faith” to “partial faith” and finally to “complete faith”⁽⁴⁾, framed by Mary and the official as another two Jewish and Gentile examples of complete faith. Two comments are interjected at the same place in both journeys, the first one by the narrator, criticizing faith based on signs (2,23–25), and the second one by Jesus commending the essential “work” of mission (4,31–38). The movement of the text forms a “synthetic parallelism” (a, b, c / a¹, b², c²)⁽⁵⁾ that can be charted as follows:

Miracle in Cana: Complete faith in a Jewish context: example of the mother of Jesus (2,1–11)

JEWS (2,12–3,36)

A No faith: Jews (2,12–22)

Comment: criticism of faith based on signs (2,23–25)

B Partial faith: Nicodemus (3,1–21)

C Complete faith: John the Baptist (3,22–36)

NON-JEWS (4,1–42)

A’ No faith: Samaritan woman 1 (4,1–15)

B’ Partial faith: Samaritan woman 2 (4,16–26)

Comment: recalling the essential ‘work’ (4,31–38)

C’ Complete faith: Samaritans (4,27–30.39–42)

Miracle in Cana: Complete faith in a non-Jewish context: example of the official (4,43–54)

2. Evaluation of Moloney’s View

Although this innovative proposal is now thirty years old and stems from one of the “premier Johannine authorities of our day”⁽⁶⁾, it has, to my knowledge, never been discussed in any detail. There is nothing new in defining the textual unit by the *inclusio* of the two miracles or in noticing the shift within John 2–4 from Jewish to non-Jewish interlocutors (see discussion below). Yet where Moloney is the most creative, in the postulate of two parallel journeys from “no faith” to “complete faith” (2,12–3,36; 4,1–42), that’s where questions arise.

⁽³⁾ MOLONEY, “From Cana to Cana”, 202.

⁽⁴⁾ Ibid., 200–201; *The Gospel of John*, 64–65.

⁽⁵⁾ F.J. MOLONEY, *Belief in the Word*. Reading John 1–4 (Minneapolis, MN 1993) 199, n. 9.

⁽⁶⁾ So P. ANDERSON in a review in *RBL* 12 (2006) on Moloney’s *The Gospel of John*. Text and Context (Leuven 2005).

a) The Mother of Jesus

While the faith of the royal official is emphatically mentioned (4,50.53), there is no corresponding comment for Mary. Moloney finds in Mary's words "Do whatever he tells you" (2,5) the "key to the narrative" (7) and the cause of the disciples' faith since they were able to see Jesus' sign only because of her command to the servants (8). Moloney's emphasis on Mary's mediatorial faith in John 2 might reflect a renewed confessional confidence among Catholic Biblical scholars in contrast to the previous generation. Raymond Brown, at least, insisted that "the evangelist does nothing to stress the power of Mary's intercession at Cana" and that her words to the servants in 2,5 "stress the sovereignty of Jesus and not Mary's impetration" (9). Various observations buttress this conclusion.

(a) Finding Mary's faith as the key to the narrative means to argue from silence. Not only has, as Moloney himself observed, "the verb *pisteuein* ... not been applied to the response of the mother of Jesus in 2,1-12" (10) but the text also makes no connection between Mary's command to the servants and the disciples' ensuing faith. Most commentators would understand the text's silence to mean that Mary's symbolism as a disciple and witness is, at best, a "subordinate theological motif" (11).

(b) On the other hand, Moloney underemphasizes the narrator's explicit comment about "the disciples [who] believed in him" (2,11). While he observes here that the narrator "slows down the action to make a comment for the reader on the manifestation of the glory and the faith of the disciples" (12) he nevertheless wants to make Mary's

(7) Ibid., 83.

(8) MOLONEY (*Belief*, 91-92) expresses the tight causal connection this way: "Because the mother of Jesus, despite the rebuke that her son directed toward her, trusted completely in the efficacy of the word of Jesus, the disciples have come to see the sign, the *doxa*, and they have come to faith".

(9) R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John* (AB 29-29A; Garden City, NY 1966-1970) I, 103. While Schnackenburg finds in Mary's response (2,5) an expression of "faith", he observes that the author's interest is "eher ein marianisches als ein mariologisches" and locates the key to the most important meaning of the miracle in 2,11, the revelation of Jesus' glory. R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HThKNT; Freiburg 1965) I, 336, 341.

(10) Ibid., 91. Moloney then adds without offering any support that "the implied reader meets it in association with the disciples (v. 11)".

(11) So BROWN, *The Gospel According to John*, I, 107.

(12) MOLONEY, *Belief*, 79.

response in 2,5 the key to the narrative. Such a choice clearly overrides explicit efforts in the text to guide the reader. Moloney also wrongly prioritizes belief in the word (Mary) over faith through signs (disciples)⁽¹³⁾. The purpose statement in 20,30–31 affirms and advocates belief based on the selected signs reported in the written account. The mention of the σημεῖα, δόξα and the disciples’ faith in 2,11 form an *inclusio* with 20,30–31 and thus leave no doubt that Jesus’ miracle in John 2 is the legitimate visible cause of sound Christian faith. This is not the least indicated by the phrase ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν in 2,11 which launches a typical Johannine idiom⁽¹⁴⁾.

(c) An additional methodological weakness seems to me that Moloney emphasizes Mary’s words in 2,5 over Jesus’ comment in 2,4. If it can be agreed that among the many vivid details of a story it is the hero’s and the narrator’s voices which express the interpretive keys to a story, then Jesus’ τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί has more theological significance than Mary’s response. Together with the absence of Jesus’ genealogy and birth stories with their elaborate focus on Mary’s role as the blessed mother and servant of the Lord (e.g., Luke 1,38.42), we might even say that 2,4 aims at opposing an incipient mariological trend (see also Luke 11,27)⁽¹⁵⁾. Christologically, the rejection of the human mother underlines the Son’s divine origin from (1,14; 3,31; 5,36) and exclusive submission under (4,34; 6,38.39) the heavenly father⁽¹⁶⁾. Within the Gospel’s soteriological context, the explicit rejection of physical lineage as a condition for salvation (1,12–13; 4,9.42; 8,33–34) and the emphasis on birth ὄνθων (3,3) negate kinship relations of any kind (familial, ethnic) as

⁽¹³⁾ J.M. LIEU, “The Mother of the Son in the Fourth Gospel”, *JBL* 117 (1998) 64, n. 12 recently criticized Moloney at this point, saying that it is “inappropriate to ask whether she believed in him, whether her faith was adequate, or whether her mere request was proof of prior trust ... This is to introduce our priorities. For this narrative faith is the response to Jesus’ act, not that which prompts the request”.

⁽¹⁴⁾ For πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν see 2,11; 3,16.18; 4,39; 6,40; 7,5.31.39.48; 8,30; 9,36; 10,42; 11,45.48; 12,37.42.

⁽¹⁵⁾ J. HARTENSTEIN, *Charakterisierung im Dialog*. Maria Magdalena, Petrus, Thomas und die Mutter Jesu im Johannesevangelium (NTOA 64; Göttingen 2007) 280, 282–284 connects John 2,1–12 and Luke 11,27–28 because of a common tension between motherhood and discipleship. J. HARTENSTEIN, *Charakterisierung im Dialog*. Maria Magdalena, Petrus, Thomas und die Mutter Jesu im Johannesevangelium (NTOA 64; Göttingen 2007) 280, 282–284.

⁽¹⁶⁾ See B.F. WESTCOTT, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London 1908) I, 82.

a necessary condition or automatic benefit for discipleship. Jesus' denial of the mother-son relationship at this moment contributes to this trajectory and breaks with traditional patterns of defining religious insiders⁽¹⁷⁾.

b) The Jews

Also in contrast to Moloney's proposal, we read nothing in the pericope of the temple cleansing about the Jews' lack of faith in Jesus' words. In Moloney's eyes, the Jews were "mocking" Jesus and "arrogantly rejected his word"⁽¹⁸⁾ when they asked for a sign (2,18) and expressed their misunderstanding by asking, "It took forty-six years to build this temple, and will You raise it up in three days?" (2,20). Yet, Moloney counts the official as an example of "complete faith" although Jesus reprimands him for wanting to "see signs and wonders" (4,48). And Nicodemus is considered an example of "partial faith" although he mocks Jesus' words more clearly than anybody with his question, "How can a man be born when he is old? He cannot enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born, can he?" (3,4)⁽¹⁹⁾. As Moloney himself rightly observes regarding 2,18-20, even "the reader is almost as ignorant as 'the Jews'"⁽²⁰⁾ when it comes to Jesus' statement about raising the temple in three days. In addition, even the disciples can believe "the word which Jesus had spoken" (2,22) only after his resurrection. The Jews' response to Jesus is thus not implied evidence of their arrogance but of their ignorance. Asking the obvious question in response to a purposefully provocative and enigmatic statement is a feature 'the Jews' share with everybody else in the Gospel except the beloved disciple!⁽²¹⁾ Moloney thus over-characterizes the Jews when he reads their request (2,18) and question (2,20) as an example of "no faith". While their faith response is elaborated on later in the Gospel, they

⁽¹⁷⁾ J.H. NEYREY, *The Gospel of John* (NCBC; Cambridge 2007), comes to the same conclusion. Finding an "anti-kinship motif", he comments that "the mother of Jesus appears to be less than a hard-core believer; rather, she represents kin or blood relationship, which is found wanting here. A blood relative but not a genuine believer, she does not know his 'hour'" (Ibid., 68).

⁽¹⁸⁾ MOLONEY, *Belief*, 104, 109.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Reading John 3,4, NEYREY (*The Gospel of John*, 78) can write: "When he [Nicodemus] mocks Jesus, his ridicule suggests that his misunderstanding is complete".

⁽²⁰⁾ Ibid., 99.

⁽²¹⁾ See the disciples' misunderstandings in 11,11-13; 13,8-10.27-29.36-37; 14,4-5.7-8; 16,16-17; 21,22-23.

seem to function at this point as a narrative partner in building the Gospel’s temple Christology.

c) Nicodemus

With regard to 3,1-21, Barrett rightly observes that Nicodemus “is quickly forgotten”⁽²²⁾ as the discourse shifts to a second plural in 3,11-12 (οὐ λαμβάνετε ... 12 ... ὑμῖν ... οὐ πιστεύετε) and then to the theological monologue in 3,13-21⁽²³⁾. In my count, the author spends 193 words on Jesus’ dialogue with Nicodemus (3,1-11, see σοι in v.11) and 193 words on further reflections in 3,12-21. Thus, summarizing all of 3,1-21 as “Nicodemus’ partial faith” does not fit at least half of the text. In addition, the generalizing language and gnomic style (κόσμος and ἄνθρωποι in 3,16.17.19; πᾶς in 3,16) direct attention away from the Jewish interlocutor⁽²⁴⁾. Nicodemus is thus introduced (ἄνθρωπος in 2,25) and interpreted (3,16-21) as a human example of someone whose lack of understanding and response to Jesus’ words and deeds reflects not merely a Jewish dilemma but an universal one. Moloney’s distinction into Jewish (2,1–3,36) and non-Jewish interlocutors (4,1–42) is thus too neat. Also, in Moloney’s eyes, Nicodemus’ partial faith is characterized not by “refusal” but merely by “limitations of his understanding of Jesus (v. 2)”, by “a misunderstanding of Jesus’ words (v. 4)” and by “a stunned puzzlement (v. 9)”⁽²⁵⁾. Yet Jesus qualifies his signs-faith (see ἐπίστευσαν in 2,23) as ‘no faith’ because the teacher of Israel ironically does not “know” (γινώσκεις, 3,10) what Jesus is talking about and becomes thereby the first narrative example of “the world” which “did not know him” (οὐκ ἔγνω, 1,10)⁽²⁶⁾. Consequently, Jesus points out the Jewish leader’s representative unbelief at the end of his dialogue (οὐ πιστεύετε, 3,12), which is why he cannot reveal heavenly secrets to people like him.

d) John the Baptist

Furthermore, an alleged topos of John the Baptist’s “complete faith” is far from evident in 3,22-36 since it is nowhere mentioned

(22) C.K. BARRETT, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Philadelphia, PE 1978) 202.

(23) MOLONEY (*Belief*, 106) observes himself that “at best, Nicodemus remains in the background in vv. 11-21 ...”.

(24) L. KIERSPEL, *The Jews and the World in the Fourth Gospel*. Parallelism, Function, and Context (WUNT 2.220; Tübingen 2006) 149.

(25) MOLONEY, *Belief*, 115.

(26) The previous (and first) use of γινώσκω in the Gospel with a subject other than Jesus (so in 1,48; 2,24.25) is found in 1,10.

that he believed. While his function as a witness certainly implies personal and complete faith, the actual dialogue with his disciples (3,25-30) centers on a testimony to Jesus as the messianic bridegroom followed by a christological monologue with a prophetic warning (3,31-36).

e) The Samaritan woman

In the same way, it is never mentioned that the Samaritan woman “believed”. As with John the Baptist, her faith is implied in her explicit “witness” to her villagers (4,39.28-29). Similar to Moloney’s emphasis of Mary’s alleged faith in 2,5 at the expense of the disciples’ faith in 2,11, it is the Samaritans’ faith that is stressed (ἐπίστευσαν, 4,41), not that of the woman. She herself is presented as a paragon of a worker in the harvest as taught and expected from the male disciples (4,35-38)⁽²⁷⁾ and the Samaritans are the model example of faith based on verbal testimony as opposed to visible signs.

In sum, Moloney finds faith where none is reported (Mary, John the Baptist, Samaritan woman) and postulates unbelief where the text is quiet (the Jews, Samaritan woman, 4,1-15) while underrating explicit references to the faith of the disciples (2,11.22). That ought to call for caution regarding his overall structure for John 2–4.

II. Inverted Parallelism: Proposal for Reading John 2–4

In the following we suggest an inverted arrangement of John 2–4, what has often been called the Cana-to-Cana cycle.

1. *From Cana to Cana* (2,1-12+4,43-54)

After the cosmic (1,1-18) and historical opening (1,19-51) of the Gospel, the first miracle (Wedding in Cana) in chapter 2 and the second miracle at the end of chapter 4 (healing of the official’s son) form an *inclusio* that delimit the next textual unit. Before establishing the case, we will first discuss alternative proposals.

⁽²⁷⁾ The Samaritans believe διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναίκος (4,39). The combination of πιστεύειν + διὰ + object is elsewhere in the Gospel used only of John the Baptist and his witness (1,7) and in Jesus’ prayer for “those also who believe in Me through their word (διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ)”. The Samaritan woman is thus characterized as a model of a witness for Christ.

a) The Beginning of the Narrative Unit: The Wedding in Cana

(a) The first miracle in Cana (2,1-12) is sometimes viewed as the conclusion of the previous testimonies and callings of disciples (1,19-51)⁽²⁸⁾. Jesus’ promise to Nathanael, that he would see “greater things” (μείζω τούτων, 1,50) is thus seen as fulfilled in the miracle at the wedding. As a more “private miracle”, it confirms the disciples’ earlier responses of faith (1,38-39.45.50; 2,11) before the public ministry begins with the temple cleansing⁽²⁹⁾. More specifically, since Origen the reference to the “third day” in 2,1, when connected with the “(next) day” mentioned in 1,29.35.43, is quite often computed into a six-day week at least, if not even a seven-or eight-day week:

DAY	SIX DAYS ⁽³⁰⁾	SEVEN DAYS ⁽³¹⁾	EIGHT DAYS ⁽³²⁾
1	1,19-28		
2	1,29-34	Same as before	Same as before
3	1,35-42		
4	1,43-51	1,40-42	1,40-42
5		1,43-51	1,43-51
6	2,1-11		
7		2,1-11	
8			2,1-11

The seven- and eight-day schemes understand the expression τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην in 1,39 as a signal for the close of the third day before the fourth day begins in 1,40. In addition, the seven-day scheme counts the “third day” in 2,11 from day no. five, but including it⁽³³⁾, while the eight-day scheme excludes it. The six-day scheme followed by the Passover in 2,13 is then understood as an

⁽²⁸⁾ C.F. KEIL, *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes* (Leipzig 1881) 36; WESTCOTT, *The Gospel*, I, lxxxviii; F.F. BRUCE, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1983) 24.

⁽²⁹⁾ BARRETT, *The Gospel*, 189.

⁽³⁰⁾ So J. FREY, *Die johanneische Eschatologie* (WUNT 116; Tübingen 1998) II, 192-196 — where he refers also to Origen (Ioh., VI, 258-259), Bengel, Luthardt, Barrett, Olsson.

⁽³¹⁾ So already C.E. LUTHARDT, *Das johanneische Evangelium nach seiner Eigenthümlichkeit* (Nürnberg 1852) 76-78; M.-E. BOISMARD, *Du Baptême à Cana (Jean, 1,19-2,11)* (LD 18; Paris 1956); T. BARROSSE, “The Seven Days of the New Creation in St. John’s Gospel”, *CBQ* 21 (1959) 507-516, and others.

⁽³²⁾ See B. LINDARS, *The Gospel of John* (NCB; London 1972) 128.

⁽³³⁾ BRUCE (*The Gospel of John*, 68) notes that “we should say ‘two days later’ (Moffatt)”.

“artistic balance with Holy Week at the end of the ministry” (see 12,1, six days plus passover)⁽³⁴⁾ or, more often, as an echo of the creation-week in Genesis 1, implying an emphasis on a new creation through Jesus’ work (see ἀρχήν in 2,11; see 2 Cor 5,17) or a new Sabbath through Jesus’ revelation (see Heb 4,9).

(b) While the “day” mentioned in 2,1 does suggest continuity with the preceding days in John 1, it is called the “third day” which does not make the allusion to days number six or seven of Genesis 1 obvious⁽³⁵⁾. Furthermore, Schnackenburg points out the lack of similarity to Genesis 1 when he observes that in contrast to God in the creation of the earth, Jesus does not begin to speak until the third day (1,38) and to act until the seventh day of the new creation (the miracle in Cana)⁽³⁶⁾. We will later turn to explicit indicators that tie 2,1-12 closer to John 2-4 than to the first chapter. Dodd interprets the “third day” in 2,1 as a symbolical reference to Jesus’ resurrection, by which the author means to say that “the whole of the incarnate ministry of the Word should have the character of the ‘third day’ of His glory”⁽³⁷⁾. We might more simply understand “third day” without any theological meaning as an indicator of time that provides a plausible chronological frame for the journey from Transjordan (see 1,28) to Cana in Galilee⁽³⁸⁾ and for the fulfillment of the prophecy given in 1,50-51⁽³⁹⁾. John 2,1-11 is placed then, among other reasons, as a “bridge-passage” that transitions the reader from the extended

⁽³⁴⁾ Ibid., 128. BARRETT, *The Gospel*, 190.

⁽³⁵⁾ More than thirty years after Boismard wrote a whole book on the alleged imitation of the first week of creation in 1,19-2,11 (Id., *Du Baptême à Cana* [1956] see n. 23), he disqualifies his own seven-day scheme as an “artificial chronological division” and now reads Jesus’ provision of wine more as a parallel to the patriarch Joseph’s provision with bread (Gen 41,55). M.-E. BOISMARD, *Moses or Jesus. An Essay in Johannine Christology* (BETHL 84-A; Leuven 1993) 23, 32-33. Boismard’s “septenary structure” of the whole Gospel has been reviewed and evaluated recently by M.A. DAISE, *Feasts in John. Jewish Festivals and Jesus’ ‘Hour’ in the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT 2.229; Tübingen 2007) 32-47.

⁽³⁶⁾ SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium*, I, 330-331.

⁽³⁷⁾ C.H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953) 300. So also BARROSSE (“The Seven Days”, 514) who nevertheless finds that the Cana miracle is also the “climactic event of the week”. According to MOLONEY (“From Cana to Cana”, 206, n. 22) the mentioning of the “days” in 2,1 and also in 4,43 relates the Cana-miracles to the resurrection.

⁽³⁸⁾ FREY, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, II, 192.

⁽³⁹⁾ So already W. BAUER, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen 1933) 44.

prologue to the first literary unit in John 2–4⁽⁴⁰⁾. As Julian puts it, "divisions between literary units are not impenetrable brick walls"⁽⁴¹⁾.

b) The End of the Narrative Unit: The Healing of the Official's Son

There exists a bewildering diversity of proposals about the end of the first literary unit after the prologue:

PROPONENT	UNIT	HEADING
Staley (1986)	1,19–3,36	The First Ministry Tour
Beasley-Murray (1999)	2,1–4,42	The Revelation of the New Order in Jesus
Kysar (1986)	2,1–5,48	Signs and Speeches
Keener (2005)	1,19–6,71	Witness in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee

(a) Staley takes the focus on John the Baptist in 1,19–42 and 3,25–36 as "the beginning and ending points of a concentric pattern"⁽⁴²⁾, followed by parallels of Jesus' journeys into Galilee (1,43–51) and into Judean territory (3,22–24). The proposal is driven by his thesis of a symmetric sequence of episodes analogous to the prologue. Thus, as John's witness in 1,6–8 and 1,15 frames the journey of the Light (1,9–11) and of the Logos (1,14), so also in 1,19–3,26. While the analogies to the Baptist are at hand, all other correspondences seem forced⁽⁴³⁾ and the separation of 1,19–2,1 at 1,43 interrupts the various callings that are united by the 'day' scheme.

(b) Beasley-Murray finds a structural pattern in John 2–12 according to which one or two signs are followed by related discourses. As Dodd before him, Beasley-Murray regards the cleansing of the temple as a sign that, together with the changing of water into wine, is followed by the discourses with Nicodemus and the Samaritan ("The

⁽⁴⁰⁾ BROWN, *The Gospel According to John*, I, cxliii, 106. F.J. MOLONEY (ed.), *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (AB; New York 2003) 301.

⁽⁴¹⁾ P. JULIAN, *Jesus and Nicodemus. A Literary and Narrative Exegesis of Jn. 2,23–3,36* (EUS 771; Frankfurt a.M. 2000) 262. A.J. KÖSTENBERGER, *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2004) 56, 166 affirms the *inclusio* of John 2–4 but maintains also a seven-day scheme in 1,19–2,12.

⁽⁴²⁾ J.L. STALEY, "The Structure of John's Prologue: Its Implications for the Gospel's Narrative Structure", *CBQ* 48 (1986) 241–263, here 250.

⁽⁴³⁾ The focus in 1,9–11 is not on a journey motif (only in v.9) but on the ironic rejection of the light which hardly corresponds to Philip's calling and Nathanael's witness in 1,43–51. The rich Christological and soteriological statement of 1,14 is also no match to the author's geographical interest in 3,22–24. To attach a journey-motif to 1,9–11 and 1,14 is hiding more of the text's content than revealing it.

Revelation of the New Order in Jesus”)(⁴⁴). In 4,43–5,47, the healing of the βασιλικός’ son and the paralytic at Bethesda are two signs followed by a discourse on their significance in relation to Jesus’ eschatological task; and so on(⁴⁵). While the link between sign and discourse is a Johannine feature also noticed by others(⁴⁶), the temple cleansing should not be considered a σημεῖον, if for no other reason than that the healing is called the “second sign” (4,54) after the changing of water to wine (see 2,11)(⁴⁷). Morris’ connection between the Samaritan discourse and the healing of the official’s son is thus more convincing(⁴⁸). But even reading the temple cleansing as a σημεῖον does not settle its position within the context. Köstenberger incorporates it into a structural pattern of “three inaugural signs” in John 2–4 followed by “three further signs which are characterized by mounting controversy” in John 5–9 and finishing with the climactic sign of Lazarus’ resurrection(⁴⁹).

(c) According to Kysar, the text in John 2–5 narrates a series of works and discourses that constitutes “the foundation of Jesus’ ministry and sets the direction which the following chapters take”(⁵⁰). Yet the persecution and attempt to kill Jesus after his healing on a Sabbath (5,16–18) belongs to a response of hostility that is foreign to John 2–4 and unites John 5 with the following development of a growing conflict(⁵¹). On the other hand, John 5 and 6 are closely connected through the theme of Jesus’ superiority over Moses(⁵²) which makes a major structural break between these chapters unlikely.

(⁴⁴) G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (WBC; Nashville, TN 1999), xci. See DODD, *Interpretation*, 297. So also D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester 1991) 239. A. KÖSTENBERGER, “The Seventh Johannine Sign: A Study in John’s Christology”, *BBR* 5 (1995) 87–103.

(⁴⁵) BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, xci–xcii, also 79–80.

(⁴⁶) See my discussion in KIERSPEL, *The Jews and the World*, 136–138.

(⁴⁷) Within a chiasmic reading of John 2–4, the σημεῖα in 3,2 could make narratological sense when referring to both signs in John 2,1–11 and 4,46–54.

(⁴⁸) L. MORRIS, *Jesus is the Christ*. Studies in the Theology of John (Grand Rapids, MI 1989) 23.

(⁴⁹) KÖSTENBERGER, “The Seventh Johannine Sign”, 102.

(⁵⁰) R. KYSAR, *John* (ACNT; Minneapolis, MN 1986) 44.

(⁵¹) One indicator is that the terms διώκω (15,20) and ἀποκτείνω (5,18; 7,1.19–20.25; 8,22.37.40; 11,53; 12,10; 16,2; 18,31) do not occur before John 5. See also R.A. CULPEPPER, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (Nashville, TN 1998) 69, 128.

(⁵²) See C.S. KEENER, *The Gospel of John*. A Commentary (Peabody, MA 2003) I, 636.

(d) Despite the length of his introduction (over 300 pages!), Keener does not offer any significant discussion in his commentary about the structure of the Gospel, which seems to reflect a lack of interest in the narrative design of the text⁽⁵³⁾. Consequently, he contends with a minimalist outline that runs along temporal and geographical markers. He observes that “whereas the named feast dominating parts of 1,19–6,70 is Passover (2,13.23; 6,4) ... Tabernacles dominates 7,10–10,42”⁽⁵⁴⁾. The two feasts merely serve here as broad markers of chronology without further theological significance. The absence of the Passover from 1,19–2,12 only indicates that closer attention to the content might yield better results than suggested by Keener.

c) The two miracles in Cana as an *inclusio*

Obviously, each proposal is part of a larger view on the Gospel’s structure and narrative design and we cannot fully discuss any of these within the limits of this article. The different suggestions do show that most Johannine scholars are not content to simply view John 2–12 as the ‘book of signs’ without further discrimination of narrative development through distinct literary units⁽⁵⁵⁾. Yet the strong support for viewing both Cana-miracles as an *inclusio* rests on highly visible literary clues:

(a) Verbal parallels: The changing of water to wine and the healing of the official’s son are happening both at the same location, namely in “Cana in Galilee” (2,1.11; 4,46).

(b) When narrating the second miracle, the author additionally specifies the location as the place where Jesus “had made the water wine” (4,46), thus referring to the first miracle.

(c) After calling the changing of water to wine the ἀρχή of the signs (2,11), the healing of the official’s son is numbered the δεύτερον sign (4,54), thus establishing a numerical link between both accounts.

(d) Both stories describe a σημεῖον, a ‘sign’ (2,11; 4,48.54). In distinction to that, the following miracle of healing in 5,1–9 is neither called a “sign” nor counted as the “third” miracle. While the healing of

⁽⁵³⁾ The exception that proves the point is KEENER’s (*The Gospel of John*, II, 893–895) brief discussion of the “Unity of the Discourse” in John 13–17.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, I, 427. The heading “Tabernacles and Hanukkah (7,1–10,42)” in the outline on page xvi is more precise since it includes Hanukkah as another feast within the textual unit.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ C.G. KRUSE, *The Gospel According to John* (TNTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2004) 51 is an exception since he finds John 1–12 simply marked by signs and public discourse.

the lame certainly qualifies as a “sign” and belongs to the σημεῖα (see 12,37; 20,31)⁽⁵⁶⁾, it is the first miracle in the Gospel that is characterized as an ἔργον (5,36; 7,21; see 5,17)⁽⁵⁷⁾. Being performed on a Sabbath, this healing makes Jesus’ equality with God for the first time explicit outside of the prologue (5,17-18 ἵσον ... τῷ θεῷ) and thus initiates a new theme of open conflict (persecution and desire to kill, 5,16) which was merely anticipated before.

(e) Finally, both miracles have a comparable progression from a problem (2,3; 4,46) to a request (2,3; 4,47), a sharp rebuke (2,4; 4,48), a reaction (2,5; 4,50) and a consequence (2,6-11; 4,51-53)⁽⁵⁸⁾. Further comparisons between Mary and the royal official have been suggested, but these five highly visible observations suffice to correct Kruse’s impression that the ‘Cana to Cana’ unit is “not something the evangelist makes much of in his account”⁽⁵⁹⁾. The form of writing in the first century AD lacked “punctuation, pagination, paragraphing, chaptering, and even separation of individual words”⁽⁶⁰⁾. Therefore, authors used literary cues such as *inclusio* to indicate units of thought and the Cana-to-Cana cycle has often been noticed as such⁽⁶¹⁾.

2. New Worship in a New Temple (2,13-22+4,1-42)

We suggest next that the cleansing of the temple (2,13-22) constitutes a narrative parallel to Jesus’ encounter with the Samaritan woman (4,1-42). Both stories center around the same theme, that of Jesus replacing physical centers of worship with himself as the new locus of God’s presence and new object of human worship. Jesus’ cleansing of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem is challenged by the Jews with a request for a sign (2,18). Jesus answers, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (2,19). The narrator explains, “But He was speaking of the temple of His body” (2,21), thus indicating how the raising of Jesus’ body on the day of his resurrection will

⁽⁵⁶⁾ The raising of the lame man (5,1-9) “signifies” that the son of man is able to raise the dead (5,21). So KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, I, 278.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ The use of ἔργον / ἔργα in the sense of ‘miracle’ is not unique to the Gospel of John: see Matt 11,2-5.19-20; Luke 24,19; Acts 7,22; etc.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ MOLONEY, “From Cana to Cana”, 190.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ KRUSE, *John*, 51.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ P.F. ELLIS, “Inclusion, Chiasm, and the Division of the Fourth Gospel”, *SVTQ* 43 (1999) 273.

⁽⁶¹⁾ JULIAN (*Jesus and Nicodemus*, 261) lists many representatives of this view and calls it a majority view among Johannine scholars. P.-B. SMIT, “Cana-to-Cana or Galilee-to-Galilee”, *ZNW* 98 (2007) 143-149.

replace worship in the physical temple. The encounter with the Samaritan woman and with Jesus’ disciples lends itself for a concentric structure. After the introduction (4,1-4), the pericope develops as follows:

- A Meeting at the Well (4,5-8)
- B Dialogue with the woman about Water (4,10-15)
- C True worship explained by the Messiah (4,16-26)
- B’ Dialogue with disciples about Bread (4,27-38)
- A’ Meeting in the City (4,39-42)⁽⁶²⁾

The parallels between the dialogues with the woman and the disciples are particularly striking. Both contain a misunderstanding, one about water (4,10), one about food (4,33). Both contain astonishment about Jesus’ inclusivity, one with regard to non-Jews (4,9), the other regarding women (4,27). The center lies in 4,16-24 in which the dialogue develops from the personal adultery of the woman (4,16-19) to the national idolatry of the Samaritans (4,20-26). The key term προσκυνέω, ‘to worship,’ is used here nine out of eleven times in the Gospel⁽⁶³⁾. After the woman recognizes that Jesus is a prophet, she turns to the central religious conflict between Jews and Samaritans: “Our fathers worshiped in this mountain, and you people say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship” (4,20). Jesus responds that “an hour is coming when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall you worship the Father” (4,21) and that “the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth” (4,23).

a) Parallels between John 2,13-22 and 4,1-42

At least three links connect core elements of both stories with each other.

⁽⁶²⁾ The proposal is mine, but leans mainly on J. BLIGH, “Jesus in Samaria”, *HeyJ* 3 (1962) 329-346. A concentric structure for 4,1-42 is also proposed by J.P. CAHILL, “Narrative Art in John IV”, *RSB* 2 (1982) 42; C.H. TALBERT, *Reading John. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (Macon, GA 2005) 126 (his structure has seven elements). JULIAN, *Jesus and Nicodemus*, 272; M.L. COLOE, *God Dwells with Us. Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN 2001) 86-90; J. McWHIRTER, *The Bridegroom Messiah and the People of God. Marriage in the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS 138; Cambridge 2006) 69; T.D. NILSEN, “The True and the False: The Structure of John 4,16-26”, *BN* 128 (2006) 61-64 even structures the center 4,16-26, concentrically. S.T. UM, *The Theme of Temple Christology in John’s Gospel* (LNTS 312; Edinburgh 2006) 188 finds an ABBA-pattern for John 4,23-24.

⁽⁶³⁾ John 4,20 (2x).21.22 (2x).23 (2x).24 (2x); 9,38; 12,20.

(a) The Samaritan's question about her mountain or Jerusalem as the proper center for worship (4,20) recalls the previous cleansing of the temple and Jesus' replacement of it. The reference to "Jerusalem" immediately preceding 4,20 is found in 2,13 and 2,23, thus framing the account of the temple cleansing and forming a terminological link between both stories. The reader, prepared by a sequential reading of the Gospel, immediately identifies the woman's lack of knowledge since the raising of Jesus' body, announced earlier in 2,19, renders her alleged alternatives between Jerusalem or Samaria as outdated.

(b) Both stories date the upcoming shift of worship to the same time. While the account of the first miracle makes only a negative comment about the "hour" that has not arrived yet (2,4), Jesus mentions after the temple cleansing that the raising of his body constitutes the new temple in Jerusalem (2,19.21). And while the Samaritans' confession of Jesus as "Savior of the world" (4,42) already realizes the new worship in spirit and truth (see also 4,23), the reference to "the hour" in 4,21 points to Jesus' departure from this world (13,1) in the cross and resurrection as the moment in which Jesus is lifted up and thus glorified (17,1) to receive the worship of his disciples⁽⁶⁴⁾.

(c) Both stories center on a replacement motif as part of Jesus' cultic criticism and temple Christology (see already 1,14.51). Worship takes place neither in Jerusalem nor in Samaria, but Jesus' body is the new dwelling place of God (2,20-21). The "living water" motif in 4,10, 11 sets up an explicit contrast to Jacob's well (4,6)/Israel's religion from which the woman draws her water as a Samaritan syncretist. While various nuances of meaning can be connected with the motif of "living water"⁽⁶⁵⁾, the quest within the context for the true place of worship reminds of OT promises (Ezek 47,1-2; Joel 4,18; Zech 14,8) that "combine the life-promoting water with the eschatological

⁽⁶⁴⁾ J. DENNIS, *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel*. The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology in the Light of John 11.47-52 (WUNT 2.217; Tübingen 2006) 179 discusses 4,4-26 right after 2,13-22 and concludes that the "essential theme then of 2,13-22 has been resumed in 4,23-24".

⁽⁶⁵⁾ DENNIS (*Jesus' Death*, 178) lists associations of "living water" in Jewish texts with God's revelatory word (Isa 11,9; 55,1-11; Amos 8,11; Hab 2,14; Jer 51,16), wisdom (Prov 13,14; 16,22; 18,4), wisdom of the Torah (Sir 24,23-25; CD 6,4; 19,34), the eschatological Temple (Ezek 47,1-12; Joel 3,18; Zech 14,8; 1 Enoch 26,1-6; 11Q18 frag. 24.1), the purification of the Spirit in the day of Israel's restoration (Ezek 36,25-27; 1QS 3,6-9; 4,20-22).

Temple”⁽⁶⁶⁾ and thus presents “Jesus as the true temple who replaces the old Temple as the source of eschatological life”⁽⁶⁷⁾. It is as the new temple that Jesus inaugurates a new worship in Spirit and truth (4,23–24)⁽⁶⁸⁾.

b) Further development in John 4,1–42

The dialogue with the Samaritan repeats the concept of replacement as found in the temple cleansing⁽⁶⁹⁾ but expands it in various ways.

(a) Not only the Jewish temple in Jerusalem is replaced by Jesus, but any Gentile temple as well. While the Samaritans do participate in “Jacob’s well” and syncretize Israel’s faith, the racial distinction expressed in 4,9 and the Samaritans’ acclamation of Jesus as “Savior of the world” (4,42, not “the Jews”) identify them as non-Jews and thus as representatives of Gentiles. The Samaritan mountain of worship is Gerizim but it remains unnamed in the text. This allows us to understand Samaritans as representatives of any religion other than Judaism that worships on any mountain other than Jerusalem, such as Mount Olympus, the Acropolis in Athens, or even Capitoline hill in Rome. Thus the new form of worship introduced by Jesus stands in antithesis to any alternative location and practice of worship⁽⁷⁰⁾.

(b) John 2 focuses on the temple and John 4 on the antithesis between

⁽⁶⁶⁾ UM, *The Theme of Temple Christology*, 148, see 148–151.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ DENNIS, *Jesus’ Death*, 190. The significance of replacement is all the more evident since, as McHugh observes, Jesus “bypasses the Jerusalem motif” in the temple promise of Ezek 47,1–10 (and Zech 13,1; 14,8). J. MCHUGH, “‘In Him was life’: John’s Gospel and the Parting of the Ways”, *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (ed. J. D.G. DUNN) (Grand Rapids, MI 1999) 135.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ For the replacement motif in the temple cleansing see especially C. METZDORF, *Die Tempelaktion Jesu*. Patristische und historisch-kritische Exegese im Vergleich (WUNT 168; Tübingen 2003) and now also B. THETTAYIL, *In Spirit and Truth*. An Exegetical Study of John 4:19–26 and a theological Investigation of the Replacement Theme in the Fourth Gospel (CBET 46; Leuven 2007), esp. part II, pp. 231–471.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Various scholars observed these terminological and conceptual links between John 2,13–22 and 4,1–42 and understand them as part of a parallel theological theme of new worship or, beyond that, as part of a larger temple Christology in the Gospel: BLIGH, “Jesus in Samaria”, 337–338; TALBERT, *Reading John*, 126; UM, *The Theme of Temple Christology*, 186; CARSON, *The Gospel According to John*, 164.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ BLIGH (“Jesus in Samaria”, 338) comments that the question of temple worship is answered here not just for Samaritans but “in principle for all future Gentile Christians”. The Samaritans in John 4 are quite frequently regarded as representatives of the Gentile world. See DODD, *Interpretation*, 239.

the Samaritan mountain and Jerusalem (4,20.21). Jesus' response about new worship relativizes not just temple worship but the holy city, God's residence on earth. Part of this trajectory might be the location of the first two miracles which happen not in Jerusalem of Judea, the esteemed center of all religious life and future hopes (7,41.52), but in Cana of Galilee, an insignificant village on the margin of Israel's sacred space. When Jesus does arrive in Jerusalem, he publicly criticizes the main institution of the established religion (2,13-22).

(c) In addition to John 2, Jesus addresses the worshiper and the proper conditions of participating in "spirit and truth" (4,23.24). Whether πνεῦμα refers here to the human spirit (small 's', so most translations)⁽⁷¹⁾ or whether πνεῦμα refers to God's Holy Spirit (capital 'S' in TNIV, CEV)⁽⁷²⁾ — the statement names a new requirement by which the believer is to approach God at a new holy place.

(d) If Jerusalem and Gerizim are both replaced with a third alternative for worship, then the enmity between Jews and Samaritans is pointless and a new common ground for one messianic community becomes possible. That explains the additional missiological and ecclesiological input of John 4,31-38⁽⁷³⁾. Altogether, Jesus' dialogue with the Samaritan woman functions well as a narrative commentary and logical conclusion of the temple cleansing⁽⁷⁴⁾.

(e) One might object that Jesus' dialogue with the Samaritan woman is positioned in chapter 4 not because of its parallels with the temple cleansing in John 2 but because of its contrast with the preceding Nicodemus story in John 3, thus suggesting a linear progressive reading as opposed to a circular concentric one. Carson and Köstenberger, for

⁽⁷¹⁾ The text thus points to an inward worship based on God's incorporeal being, see ASV, NAS, RSV, NRS, KJV, NKJ, ESV, CSB, NET, NLT.

⁽⁷²⁾ The expression thus refers to the new eschatological life given by the Holy Spirit. For a discussion of various interpretations for "Spirit and truth" (4,23.24) see especially now THETTAYIL, *In Spirit and Truth*, esp. 123-165.

⁽⁷³⁾ The Jewish temple "expressed an ideology of separation" by keeping the Gentiles at a distance in the outer court. KEENER, *The Gospel of John*, I, 524. Consequentially, the replacement of the temple removes not just religious but ethnic boundaries and logically opens the community for Gentile members. Thus the invitation of the explicitly Jewish Jesus (4,9.22) to the Gentile woman carries out a necessary implication of the temple cleansing.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ THETTAYIL (*In Spirit and Truth*, 9) explains that "the relationship of John 4,19-26 to the cleansing of the temple in John 2,13-22 is almost a direct one since both have worship as a prominent theme" and follows shortly after with a quote from C.K. Barrett, "the theme of 2,13-22 is thus reopened in a wider context of worship".

example, make much of the comparison between Nicodemus as the hesitant Jewish male religious leader and the responsive female Samaritan and “moral outcast”⁽⁷⁵⁾. Yet the two accounts are not placed back-to-back but are separated by John the Baptist’s witness in 3,22–36, thus making an authorial contrast between Nicodemus and the Samaritan at least less obvious. Even upon granting such an intended comparison, a strict contrast between concentric and progressive ways of reading narratives is unnecessary. Jesus’ dialogue with the Samaritan woman is a good example for both reading strategies. A concentric perception finds in 4,20–26 (key-term προσκυνέω) the story’s center of theology while a sequential reading identifies a progressing Christology from Jesus as Ἰουδαῖος in 4,9 to him as the σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου in 4,42.

When taken together, 2,12–22 and 4,1–42 introduce the reader to a temple Christology that negotiates the new faith in contrast with material forms of Jewish and Gentile worship.

3. *Salvation & Judgment* (3,1–21+3,22–36)

a) The Parallel Make-up of 3,1–21 and 3,22–36

Jesus’ dialogue with Nicodemus and following monologue (3,1–21) together with John the Baptist’s last witness in the Gospel (3,22–36) stand at the center of the concentric design in John 2–4 and “form a diptych”⁽⁷⁶⁾. The two stories are separated by a shift of place from Jerusalem to Judea (3,22) and a shift of personal from Jesus and Nicodemus to John the Baptist, his disciples and the Jews. Yet the literary and theological unity of the chapter is evident from their make-up marked by various parallels.

(a) Both episodes progress from a narrative exposition (2,23–25; 3,22–24) to a dialogue (3,1–12; 3,25–30) and finally to a monologue (3,13–21; 3,31–36)⁽⁷⁷⁾, although scholars disagree on the exact point of transition from dialogue to monologue in Jesus’ discourse with Nicodemus⁽⁷⁸⁾:

⁽⁷⁵⁾ CARSON, *The Gospel According to John*, 216. KÖSTENBERGER, *John*, 112. M.M. PAZDAN, “Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship”, *BTB* 17 (1987) 145–148.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John*, 89.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ So first Y. IBUKI, “Gedankenaufbau und Hintergrund des 3. Kapitels des Johannesevangeliums”, *Bulletin of Seikie University* 14 (1978) 9–33, esp. 11.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Some propose that the monologue begins already in 3,11 (cf. DODD, *Interpretation*, 301, 305); others in 3,13, e.g., U. SCHNELLE, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (ThHK 4; Leipzig 1998) 73; others in 3,14, e.g., K. WENGST, *Das*

	2,23–3,21	3,22–36
Narrative Exposition	2,23–25 ⁽⁷⁹⁾	3,22–24
Dialogue	3,1–12	3,25–30
Monologue	3,13–21	3,31–36

(b) There is the formal parallel of the introductory statements by Nicodemus and John the Baptist in 3,2 (οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ... ποιεῖν ... ἐὰν μή ... and 3,27 (οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν ... ἐὰν μή ...)⁽⁸⁰⁾.

(c) Both episodes operate with an antithesis between the physical and the spiritual. Upon hearing of the need to be ‘born again/above,’ Nicodemus thinks of physical birth (3,4), yet Jesus talks about being “born of water and Spirit” (3,5). When debating physical purification with the Jews (περὶ καθαρισμοῦ, 3,25), John the Baptist points to Jesus who was sent by God to give “the Spirit without limit” (3,34)⁽⁸¹⁾.

(d) Both dialogues turn into monologues (without a clear transition, 3,13; 3,31) which themselves open “with a claim that Jesus is the unique revealer of the heavenly (vv. 12–15.31–35)”⁽⁸²⁾ and finish by contrasting faith and unbelief (3,18–21.36)⁽⁸³⁾. Much of the vocabulary in the second monologue repeats that of the first one, such as “from heaven” (3,31; 3,12 [ἐπουράνια]. 13), “witness” that is not received (3,11.32), “God sent” (3,17.34), “Spirit” (3,5–8.34), “to believe” (3,16.18.36), and “eternal life” (3,12.15.16.18.36).

Johannesevangelium (ThKNT 4.1; Stuttgart 2000) I, 136; NA 27th or in 3,16; cf. CARSON, *The Gospel According to John*, 203; L. MORRIS, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1995) 202.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ We have mentioned above that 2,23–25 is a bridge-passage that concludes the account of the temple-cleansing and, at the same time, introduces Jesus’ encounter with Nicodemus. The narrator finishes 2,25 with αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκειν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ and opens the very next sentence with Ἦν δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος (3,1), thus showing that Nicodemus is an example of a kind of believer whose signs-faith merits Jesus’ suspicion.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ J. FREY, *Die johanneische Eschatologie* (WUNT 117; Tübingen 2000) III, 244.

⁽⁸¹⁾ KEENER (*The Gospel of John*, I, 533) finds that Jesus speaks in 3,5 about “true purification” which “contrasts forcefully with mere Jewish water rituals (3,25).” MOLONEY (*The Gospel of John*, 92) explains that in the rebirth ‘of water’ (3,5) the promises of John the Baptist, mentioned in 1,29–34, “are being realized”.

⁽⁸²⁾ MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John*, 89.

⁽⁸³⁾ W. KLAIBER, “Der irdische und der himmlische Zeuge: Eine Auslegung von Joh 3,22–36”, *NTS* 36 (1990) 211. He continues to describe similarities in the progression of the dialogue, even though he admits that the parallels are not exact.

(e) In both monologues God ‘loves’ (ἀγαπάω) and (therefore) ‘gives’ (δίδωμι) something, but the objects to these verbs are different, if not even exactly reversed. In the first monologue, God loves “the world” and gives his “Son” (3,16), a statement concerning salvation. In the second monologue, God loves “the Son” and gives him πάντα, including the world (v. 35), emphasizing judgment (see ἡ ὁργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ in 3,35).

(f) Finally, the whole chapter is held together by the *inclusio* of the phrases “see the kingdom of God” in 3,3 (ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ) and “see life” in 3,36 (ὄψεται ζωὴν)⁽⁸⁴⁾. Both phrases characterize true believing as a form of ‘seeing’ spiritual truth in marked contrast to the “beholding” (θεωροῦντες) of material signs that previously caused Jesus’ suspicion about false faith (2,23)⁽⁸⁵⁾. Despite some remaining questions⁽⁸⁶⁾, these and other formal and textual parallels render the many source-critical theories of dislocation and transposition within John 3 unconvincing⁽⁸⁷⁾.

b) The Central Significance of 3,13-21

The narratological and theological gravity in John 3 is found in the monologues of 3,(11)13-21 and 3,31-36. These rich theological expositions are prepared beforehand by the narration of action which leads in turn to a dialogue, a typical development of Johannine discourse⁽⁸⁸⁾. Although John the Baptist’s monologue in 3,31-36 might appear as a shortened “duplicate” of the speech in 3,13-21⁽⁸⁹⁾, it does not just repeat previous statements but has its own contribution to make. Some important expressions and themes in the Gospel are launched from this text, such as the ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ (3,33; 8,47)⁽⁹⁰⁾, the Father’s love for the Son (3,35; also 5,20; 10,17;

⁽⁸⁴⁾ FREY, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*, III, 244.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ See also JULIAN’s (*Jesus and Nicodemus*, 31-45) review of other proposals for structuring John 3.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ See BROWN, *The Gospel According to John*, I, 135.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ For a brief review see JULIAN, *Jesus and Nicodemus*, 28-29.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Brown counts the development from dialogue to monologue among the characteristics of Johannine discourse. R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel and Epistles of John*. A Concise Commentary (Collegeville, MN 1988) 19. See also John 5,1-9 (action: healing), 5,10-18 (dialogue), 5,19-47 (monologue).

⁽⁸⁹⁾ BROWN (*The Gospel and Epistles of John*, 19) finds “duplicate speeches” in the Gospel of John and counts 3,31-36 among them.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ The ῥήματα of Jesus (5,47; 6,63.68; 8,20.47; 12,47.48; 15,7) are the words of God (3,34; 17,8; see 14,10).

15,9; 17,23.24.26) and that Jesus was given all things into his hands (3,35; also 5,22). On the other hand, the emphasis on obedience and God's wrath, typical for a prophet, are only found here in the Gospel (ἀπειθῶν, ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ in 3,36)⁽⁹¹⁾ and form a fitting conclusion for the whole chapter. For various reasons Jesus' lengthy monologue in 3,13-21 stands out as the theological heavyweight in John 3 and maybe even in the Gospel.

(a) As the following list shows, this monologue is the longest speech of Jesus compared with any of his other speeches in John 2–4, no matter where one identifies the beginning of the monologue (either in verse 11, verse 13, verse 14, or verse 16):

DIRECT SPEECH OF JESUS / JOHN B.	NUMBER OF JESUS' WORDS
Miracle in Cana (2,4.7-8)	15 words
Cleansing of Temple (2,16.19)	22 words
Jesus and Nicodemus (3,3.5-8.10-21)	307 words
Monologue 3,11-21	221 words
Monologue 3,13-21	178 words
Monologue 3,14-21	161 words
Monologue 3,16-21	136 words
John the Baptist (3,31-36)	103 words
Jesus and Samaritan woman (4,7.10.13b-14.16.17b-18.21-24.26)	176 words
Monologue 4,21-24	79 words
Jesus and his disciples (4,32.34-38)	102 words
Monologue 3,34-38	94 words
Miracle in Cana (4,48.50)	14 words
TOTAL	739 words

(b) But Jesus' speech in John 3 in general and the monologue in particular are not only the largest discourse within John 2–4, they also have the least amount of situational reference or, in other words, they display the strongest timeless theological character. Not only does the ἄμην ἄμην formula appear exclusively in John 3 within John 2–4, but it is used here by Jesus no less than three times (3,3.5.11), thus highlighting the significance of the saying beyond the immediate occasion⁽⁹²⁾. The only situational reference is found in 3,10, "Are you

⁽⁹¹⁾ The unique contribution of 3,31-36 is also indicated by other terms that occur only once (μέτρον in 3,34) or twice (σφραγίζω in 3,33; 6,27) in the Gospel.

⁽⁹²⁾ The ἄμην ἄμην formula appears in the following places in the Fourth Gospel: 1,51; 3,3.5.11; 5,19.24.25; 6,26.32.47.53; 8,34.51.58; 10,1.7; 12,24; 13,16.20.21.38; 14,12; 16,20.23; 21,18.

the teacher of Israel, and do not understand these things?” In contrast, the other stories in John 2–4 contain much more situational flavor and less theological style (see 2,4.7.8.16; 4,7.16.18).

(c) The theological character of Jesus’ speech in John 3 goes back first of all to vocabulary that occurred previously only in John 1,1–18, such as λαμβάνω, γεννάω, ζωή, φῶς, ἀλήθεια, μονογενής, οὐδείς, κόσμος (apart from 1,29)⁽⁹³⁾. This selection of key terms from the prologue⁽⁹⁴⁾ creates continuity with the interpretive opening of the Gospel, extends the hermeneutical lens provided at the beginning and thus highlights the theological significance of this monologue.

(d) But even more than the retrospective link with the prologue, the monologue in 3,13–21 sets the stage for theological language and concepts that dominate the rest of the Gospel and are thus typical of the Johannine idiom. The following terms appear in John 3,13–20 for the first time in the Gospel: ἀναβαίνω for Jesus’ ascent (3,13), καταβαίνω for Jesus’ descent (3,13), ὑψόω (3,14), ὁ πιστεύων (3,15.16.18.36), πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων (3,15.16), ζωὴ αἰώνιος (3,15.16.36), ἀγαπάω (3,16.19.35), ἀπόλλυμι (3,16), ἀποστέλλω for God sending his Son (3,17.34), κρίνω (3,17.18), σφάζω (3,17), ἤδη (3,18), κρίσις (3,19), σκότος (3,19), πονηρός (3,19), ἔργον (3,19.20.21), ἐργάζομαι (3,21), μισέω (3,20), ἐλέγχω (3,20), φαῦλος (3,20), πρόσσω (3,20).

Literally every sentence in this section introduces important language used later in the Gospel, as the highlighted terms in the following paragraph demonstrate:

3,13 No one has *ascended* into heaven except the One who *descended* from heaven— the Son of Man.¹⁴ Just as Moses *lifted up* [also 8,28; 12,32.34] the snake in the wilderness, so the Son of Man must be *lifted up*,¹⁵ so that *everyone who believes* in Him will have *eternal life*.¹⁶ “For God *loved* the world in this way: He gave His One and Only Son, so that *everyone who believes* in Him will not *perish* but have *eternal life*.¹⁷ For God did not *send His Son* into the world that He might *judge* the world, but that the world might be *saved* through Him.¹⁸ *Anyone who believes* in Him is not *judged*, but *anyone who does not believe* is already *judged*, because he has not believed in the name of the One and Only Son of God.¹⁹ “This, then, is the *judgment*: the light has come into the world, and people *loved*

⁽⁹³⁾ See ζωή (1,4; 3,15.16.36; etc.), φῶς (1,4.5.7.8.9; 3,19.19.20.21; etc.), ἀλήθεια (1,14.17; 3,21; etc.), μονογενής (1,14.18; 3,16.18), οὐδείς (1,18; 3,2.13.32; etc.).

⁽⁹⁴⁾ The most important key terms in the prologue are the following: ζωή, φῶς, σκοτία, μαρτυρία, μαρτυρέω, πιστεύω, σάρξ, ἀλήθεια, γεννάω, μονογενής, Μωϋσῆς, νόμος. See KIERSPEL, *The Jews and the World*, 117, 138.

darkness rather than the light because their *deeds* were *evil*.²⁰ For everyone who *practices wicked things* hates the light and avoids it, so that his *deeds* may not be *exposed*.²¹ But anyone who lives by the truth comes to the light, so that *his works* may be shown to be *accomplished* by God⁽⁹⁵⁾.

(e) While the Gospel's Christology is furthered in 3,13 with the reference to Jesus' descent and ascent (ἀναβαίνω, καταβαίνω), the major contribution of this section lies in its soteriological content: (i) The cross is interpreted with the help of Numbers 21 as a necessary (δεῖ) elevation of the Savior (3,14; also 12,32.34) that invites "everyone who believes" to have "eternal life" (3,15.16). The substantival participle ὁ πιστεύων is introduced here for the first time as well as the eschatological concept of ζωὴ αἰώνιος in replacement of the Synoptists' βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (only in 3,5). (ii) This generous gift of life is grounded in the "love of God" (3,16) for this world. The verb ἀγαπάω occurs over thirty times in the gospel, but not before 3,16. While the author will stress elsewhere that the Father loves the Son⁽⁹⁶⁾ and that God loves those who love Jesus and keep his commandments⁽⁹⁷⁾, the κόσμος is only here the object of divine love (but see 1 John 4,10.11.19). The statement in 3,19 connects with 3,16 by keyword: God loved the world but men "loved the darkness." While the notion of God's unreturned favor is parallel to the prologue's statement about the world who did not recognize its own creator (1,9-10), the love-language of 3,16-19 adds a unique emotive force to this motif. (iii) This love of God is expressed in the "giving" (ἔδωκεν) and "sending" (ἀπέστειλεν) of his only Son. While we read previously that John the Baptist was "sent", this language is applied to Jesus only from 3,17 on⁽⁹⁸⁾. (iv) The sending of the Son means that God is not judging the world but saving it (3,17; also 12,47). The trajectory of judgment is further developed in John 5 with reference to the Son's future judgment (5,29; also 16,8) and the Paraclete's related mission (16,8.11). But the specific language of "judging" and "judgment" begins not before 3,17. (v) The κρίσις of mankind, past (3,19) and present (3,18.20), was and is the rejection of this love by hating the light (3,20) and loving the darkness (3,19). As the Gospel's love-language commences in 3,16, so does the hate-language in 3,20. The monologue finishes by grounding the negative and positive attitude to the light in the moral action of the individual (3,20-21), thus providing analysis and rationale for the world's negative response.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ So according to the *Holman Christian Standard Bible* (2004).

4. Proposal for the Structure of John 2–4

This meditation in John 3,13-21 does not exhaust the Gospel’s theology. No predicate “I am” statement has been uttered so far (but see 4,26), we have not heard anything yet of Satan (13,27; also 6,70), the “ruler of this world” (12,31; 14,30; 16,11; also 17,15), the beloved disciple (see 13,23-25; 18,15-16 (?); 19,26-27; 20,2-4.8; 21,7.20.23.24) or the Paraclete (14,16.26; 15,26; 16,7). Yet our review of John 3,13-21 justifies the conclusion that this monologue provides the main rationale, main building blocks and essential truths for Johannine soteriology⁽⁹⁹⁾. As Schlatter put it, “The first speech of Jesus, which John is presenting to us, gives us the whole word of Jesus”⁽¹⁰⁰⁾.

While John 3 stands thus at the center of an inverted parallelism in John 2–4, there exist various proposals about how to integrate that center into the context. Mlakuzhyil and Kinzer offer two attractive options:

MLAKUZHYYL (1988) ⁽¹⁰¹⁾	KINZER (1998) ⁽¹⁰²⁾
A Miracle in Cana (2,1-12)	A. First Sign at Cana (2,1-12)
B Dialogue on new temple (2,13-25+)	B. Cleansing of the Temple in Jerusalem (2,13-25)
C Discourse on eternal life (2,23-3,21)	C. (3,1-36)
C’ Discourse on life (3,22-4,3)	
B’ True temple worship (4,1-42)	B’ Discourse with the Samaritan woman (4,1-45)
A’ Miracle in Cana (4,43-54)	A’ Second sign at Cana (4,46-54)

⁽⁹⁶⁾ See 3,35; 5,20 (with φιλέω); 10,17; 15,9; 17,23.24.26.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ See 14,21.23; 16,27 (φιλέω); 17,23 (26).

⁽⁹⁸⁾ The synonym πέμπω (32 times in John) is used 24 times for God sending Jesus, 4,34; 5,23.24.30.37; 6,38.39.44; 7,16.18.28.33; 8,16.18.26.29; 9,4; 12,44.45.49; 13,16; 14,24; 15,21; 16,5. The term is applied to John the Baptist only in 1,33.

⁽⁹⁹⁾ SCHNELLE (*Das Evangelium*, 73) calls the monologue in 3,13-21 the “Zentrum der joh. Theologie”.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ “Die erste Rede Jesu, die uns Johannes gibt, legt uns somit das ganze Wort Jesu vor”, A. SCHLATTER, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Stuttgart 1965) 57.

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ G. MLAKUZHYYL, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Rome 1987) 239-241.

⁽¹⁰²⁾ M. KINZER, “Temple Christology in the Gospel of John”, *SBL 1998 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta, GA 1998) 447-465, followed by UM (*The Theme of Temple Christology*, 186).

Mlakuzhyil respects the formal parallels between Jesus' encounter with Nicodemus and John the Baptist's dispute about purification and observes their similar theme of "life." Kinzer's structure simply places all of chapter 3 at the center without any further distinctions. Our study of John 3 identified important parallels and distinctions that justify a bipartite center as follows:

- A Miracle in Cana (2,1-12)
- B New Temple: Not in Jerusalem (2,13-22)
- C Salvation: God loves the world and gave his Son/eternal life/see 'kingdom of God' (3,1-21)
- C' Judgment: God loves the Son and gave him πάντα/ life/'see life' (3,22-36)
- B New Temple: Not in Gerizim (4,1-42)
- A Miracle in Cana (4,43-54)

III. Theological Harvest of Literary Structure

1. The uniting thread in John 2–4 is an emphasis on the novelty of Jesus when compared with existing Jewish and Gentile forms of religion. Dodd masterfully brought out the larger "fundamental truth" in John 2–4, namely "that Christ has come to inaugurate a new order in religion" ⁽¹⁰³⁾. Dodd finds this indicated by the (old) water that turns into (new) wine, the new temple as foretold afterwards (2,14-19), the new birth spoken of before Nicodemus, and the new worship explained to the Samaritan woman ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. The Gospel offers a narrative version of Paul's proposition that "the old has gone, the new has come" (2 Cor 5,17) ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾.

2. Yet the contrast between old and new is too general and captures, at best, only a part of the Gospel's theological effort. I suggest that the repeated characteristic of the new faith throughout each component in John 2–4 is the contrast between physical and spiritual. The physical temple is replaced with a person (2,13-22+4,1-42). The physical birth is replaced with a spiritual one (3,1-21). The physical baptism is submitted under the one through the Holy Spirit (3,22-36). In one word, at the center of the new religion introduced by Jesus stands a "dematerialization" of religion that

⁽¹⁰³⁾ DODD, *Interpretation*, 303.

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Ibid., 297. See also LINDARS, *The Gospel of John*, 70; BROWN, *The Gospel and Epistles of John*, 16; BRUCE, *The Gospel of John*, 43-44; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, xci, 31.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ So CARSON, *The Gospel According to John*, 166.

operates without physical places and media of purification. In a world where location and purification (see καθαρισμός in 2,6; 3,25) define salvation for insiders and judgment for outsiders, the Fourth Gospel radically redefines access to God. The author’s anti-docetic Christology (e.g., 1,14; 11,35; 19,5) guards from overinterpreting his theological efforts into an absolute mind-matter dualism⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. As paradoxical as it sounds, the new religion centers on an emphatically human God (1,18; 20,28). Yet it does operate without a temple and its structured personnel, without a city, a tangible kingdom, a calendar of feasts, jars, animals, birth certificates. Even possible sacramental allusions in John 3 and 6 appear as barely visible tokens of faith when compared with the impressive amount of religious furniture in Judaism and paganism.

3. In the structural center of John 2–4 and at the heart of the contrasts therein lies a difference in the kind of “seeing” required by the old and the new religion. Verbs of “seeing” frame John 3, the center of the narrative unit (3,3.35). In his first response to Nicodemus Jesus speaks of seeing “the Kingdom of God” and thereby picks up the traditional nutshell of expectations for God’s visible reign (3,3.5). Yet the concept of God’s reign is filled with new content. The visible nature of divine rule is reoriented towards having “eternal life” now (3,15.16) and “seeing life” (3,36) through faith. Key terms of any religion, that of God’s “love”, of “saving” and “judging” are not tied to Jerusalem, a temple, an ethnic group or a rite of physical purification but to the Son as the one condition without which life is unavailable. While the narratives negotiate this theme with the situational and religious flavor of first century Palestine and Judaism, the monologue in 3,13–21 transcends a Jewish/Samaritan context and interprets the historical experience of Jesus’ ministry and his rejection in theological terms (God, love, hate, world, light, darkness). Since the miracles in John 2,1–12 and John 4,43–54 appeal to the eye and potentially stimulate a form of “seeing” that falls short of true faith (see 2,23; 4,48; 6,14–15; etc.)⁽¹⁰⁷⁾, the center of the

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ As numerous recent studies have shown, the Fourth Gospel neither offers a docetic Christology nor was it the preferred textbook of later Gnosticism. See only S. VOORWINDE, *Jesus’ Emotions in the Fourth Gospel. Human or Divine?* (LNTS 284; London 2005); C.E. HILL, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford 2004).

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ The critical notes on a kind of faith that is based on “seeing signs” (2,23; 4,48) indicate what is detailed in following chapters. Jesus’ miracles led to

chiasm defines “seeing” (3,5.36) as believing in the Son who mediates salvation (3,1-21) and judgment (3,22-36). In other words, the Gospel deconstructs an old worldview and establishes a new one. While the miracles do demonstrate divine power, the evangelist sharply disconnects that power from Jerusalem and Gerizim as traditional locations of divine presence. By offering an object and a mode of worship that operates without ocular support (2,19; 4,24), the evangelist subverts expectations of material restoration and reorients the believing eye not towards a sanctuary (e.g., Ps 63,2) but towards the Son⁽¹⁰⁸⁾.

IV. Summary & Conclusion

1. Moloney’s primary focus on different people’s journey of faith (*fides qua creditur*) does not do justice to the author’s elaborate efforts to expound on Christological and soteriological foundations as the object of faith (*fides quae creditur*). The major theme and kind of parallels suggested by Moloney capture only part of the content and overlook important clues that point to a different structural and theological design.

2. While the Cana-to-Cana *inclusio* alone does not necessitate further concentric progression of the text, the Gospel’s first theological climax in John 3 presents an obvious literary center that functions as a structural balance to both σημεῖα and strengthens a spatial perception of the narrative. The real challenge for our chiasmic proposal then seems to be found in the parallels between the temple cleansing (2,13-23) and Jesus’ dialogue with the Samaritan woman (4,1-42). Their terminological (‘Jerusalem,’ ‘hour’) and theological links (replacement motif) demonstrate their shared thrust of new worship in antithesis to traditional locations and traditions. Furthermore, the theological surplus of 4,1-42 builds on the parallel and prior reading of 2,13-23 and functions as a commentary thereof. The Christological orientation of worship in “(S)pirit and truth” (4,23.24) and the missiological inclusion of Gentiles (4,31-38) depend on an ideological break with Jerusalem and

confessions of him as “prophet” (6,14), “king” (6,15) or “Christ” (7,31) that fall short of grasping his “glory” (2,11; 1,14) and true mission (3,16).

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ It would be the worthwhile task of a separate study to trace this theme of dematerialization in the Gospel outside of John 2–4.

the temple as negotiated in Jesus’ cleansing and the interpretation of it (esp. 2,19-22).

3. The concentric design (see p. 550) thus invites the reader to move from the demonstration of divine power (2,1-11+4,43-54) toward a new Christological definition of divine presence (2,13-22+4,1-42) that culminates in a revision of salvation and judgment in light of the coming of God’s Son (3,1-21+3,22-36). At the core of the new faith and of the persuasive goal of John 2–4 stands thus a “dematerialized” religion that operates without traditional physical means of purification and worship and centers structurally as well as ideologically on the Son as the agent of God’s mission (3,16) and the object of God’s love (3,35).

4. Our proposal for the chiasm in John 2–4 satisfies many if not all criteria formulated for control⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. It is simple in design and the literary unit as well as its’ subunits follow obvious textual indicators and natural breaks. The parallels involve “central or dominant imagery or terminology, not peripheral or trivial language”⁽¹¹⁰⁾ and are often proposed by scholars regardless of macro-structural designs. Our structure can explain the text as it stands without having to eliminate texts that are inconvenient for the proposal⁽¹¹¹⁾. At the structural center stands a text that carries prime theological significance for the literary unit. Finally, this proposal comes on the heels of a growing use of chiasm in Johannine scholarship⁽¹¹²⁾ that invites to read the Gospel not

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ C. BLOMBERG, “The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1-7”, *CTR* 4 (1989) 3-20, here 5-7. D.E. AUNE, “Chiasm”, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville, KY 2003) 96.

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ BLOMBERG, “The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1-7”, 6.

⁽¹¹¹⁾ M. STIBBE, *John* (Sheffield 1993) 12 can offer his chiasmic proposal for John 2–4 only after eliminating the temple cleansing (2,13-25), 3,16-21 and 3,31-36 as “later theological reflection”.

⁽¹¹²⁾ N.W. LUND, “The Influence of Chiasmus upon the Structure of the Gospels”, *ATR* 13 (1931) 42-46, esp. 44 proposed a chiasm for John’s prologue that seems to find, with some modifications, wide acceptance (see the recent commentaries by Culpepper, Keener, Köstenberger, Kruse, and Neyrey). While explicitly resisting various proposals for a chiasmic arrangement, BROWN (*The Gospel According to John*, I, 275-276; II, 667, 728, 857-859) nevertheless organized in his commentary four texts of growing proportion in this manner: John 6,36-40; 15,7-17; 16,16-33; and the seven scenes of Jesus’ trial before Pilate in 18,28-19,16a. See also MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John*, 24 (John 13-17; 18-19); J. BEUTLER, “The Structure of John 6”, *Critical Readings of John 6* (ed. R.A. CULPEPPER) (BIS 22; Leiden 1997) 115-127; W. BROUWER, *The Literary Development of John 13-17. A Chiasmic Reading* (DS 182; Atlanta, GA 2000); J.C.

as a diligent collection of individual *pericopae* but as creative clusters of meaning.

Trinity College of the Bible
and Theological Seminary
4233 Medwell Drive
Newburgh, IN 47630, USA

Lars KIERSPEL

SUMMARY

After offering a critical analysis of Moloney's synthetical parallelism for John 2–4, this article argues for a chiasmic structure of the Cana-to-Cana cycle which directs the reader from the visible signs (2,1-12+4,43-54) and physical properties of religion (2,13-22+4,1-42) to Jesus as the metaphysical agent of God's salvation and judgment (3,1-21+3,22-36). The new "dematerialized" faith thereby subverts expectations of material restoration and reorients the believing eye not towards a sanctuary but towards the Son.

STUBE, *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farwell Discourse* (LNTS 309; London 2006), esp. 72-80. Following Østenstad, H. THYEN, *Das Johannes-evangelium* (HNT 1/6; Tübingen 2005) esp. 419-421, even finds the whole Gospel as a grand seven-part ring structure with the center in 8,12-12,50. See also note 62 in this article.

Die *damnatio* und *consecratio* der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11)

In Bezug auf die in Offb 11,7-13 gemachten, die "zwei Zeugen" (Offb 11,3) betreffenden, Voraussagen gehen die meisten Exegeten ausschließlich von einem jüdischen Hintergrund aus⁽¹⁾, wobei sie (im Großen und Ganzen) übereinstimmend folgende alttestamentliche bzw. spätjüdische Parallelen anführen⁽²⁾: (a) Ps 79,1-3 und Tob 1,18 als Parallelen zur ausbleibenden Bestattung der ermordeten zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,7-9); (b) Neh 8,12 und Est 9,19 als Parallelen zu den anlässlich ihres Todes stattfindenden, mit dem Austausch von Geschenken einhergehenden Feierlichkeiten (Offb 11,10); (c) Ez 37,10 als Parallele zu ihrer Auferstehung (Offb 11,11) sowie (d) 2 Kön 2,11, Sir 48,9 und Jos. *Ant.* 4.8.48 (326) als Parallelen zu ihrer (von einem Erdbeben begleiteten) Himmelfahrt (Offb 11,12-13). Im betreffenden Abschnitt aus den *Jüdischen Altertümern* des Josephus heißt es:

[U]nd während er [Moyses] noch mit ihnen [Eleazar und Jesus] sprach, ließ sich plötzlich eine Wolke auf ihn herab, und er entschwand in ein Tal. In den heiligen Büchern aber hat er geschrieben, er sei gestorben, aus Furcht, man möchte sagen, er sei wegen seiner hervorragenden Tugenden zu Gott hinübergegangen (Jos. *Ant.* 4.8.48 [326])⁽³⁾.

Bei der Durchsicht dieser Parallelen fällt in erster Linie negativ auf, dass sie zwar jeweils einzelne Elemente der in Offb 11,7-13

⁽¹⁾ Vgl. U.B. MÜLLER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (ÖTBK 19; Gütersloh – Würzburg 1995) 220: "Die These einer jüdischen Vorlage für Verse 3-13 ist alt (z.B. Wellhausen, Bousset, Charles, Berger, Wilckens, Pesch)." Eine Ausnahme ist D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 6-16* (WBC 52B; Nashville, TN 1998) 617-629: Hier werden auch griechisch-römische Parallelen genannt.

⁽²⁾ Vgl. z.B. AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 617-629; H. GIESEN, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (RNT; Regensburg 1997) 256-257; MÜLLER, *Offenbarung*, 214-215.218-221; P. PRIGENT, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* (Tübingen 2004) 355-357; vgl. ferner M. ÖHLER, *Elia im Neuen Testament*. Untersuchung zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum (BZNTW 88; Berlin – New York 1997) 272-279: Auch Öhler rechnet mit den herkömmlichen jüdischen Parallelen, denkt aber, dass in Offb 11,12 "[k]ein Bezug ... zur Entrückung Elias (II Reg 2) [besteht]" (277).

⁽³⁾ Josephus, *Jüdische Altertümer* (Wiesbaden 2004) 192-193.

gemachten Prophetie erhellen⁽⁴⁾, für die Prophetie als Ganze aber kein Erklärungsraster bieten, da sie aus verschiedenen Schriften, Kontexten und Epochen stammen. Darüber hinaus ist zu bemängeln, dass es weder in Neh 8,12 (Feier anlässlich der Verlesung des mosaischen Gesetzes) noch in Est 9,19 (Purimfest) um die Feier speziell des Todes eines oder mehrerer Menschen geht. Beim Purimfest freute man sich zwar auch über den Tod Hamans und seiner Söhne (Est 9,25; vgl. Est 7,10; 8,7; 9,14), feierte jedoch umfassender "die Errettung der Juden aus der Hand ihrer pers. Feinde"⁽⁵⁾.

Neben dem jüdischen rechnen einige Ausleger mit einem christlichen Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13, indem sie die Passion, Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu als Vorlage für das in Offb 11,7-13 über die zwei Zeugen Gesagte betrachten. Als Belege für diese Deutung verweisen sie v.a. auf folgende Ähnlichkeiten zwischen Offb 11,7-13 und den neutestamentlichen Zeugnissen über Jesus: (a) Die Kreuzigung Jesu als Parallele zur Ermordung der zwei Zeugen (vgl. Offb 11,8)⁽⁶⁾; (b) die als entehrend angesehene Grablegung Jesu (Mk 15,46) als Parallele zur ausbleibenden Bestattung der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,8-9)⁽⁷⁾; (c) die Aussage Jesu in Joh 16,20 als Parallele zu der in Offb 11,10 geschilderten Freude über den Tod der zwei Zeugen⁽⁸⁾; (d) die ähnlich langen Zeitspannen, die zwischen Tod und Auferstehung der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,11: μετὰ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμῖς) bzw. Jesu (vgl. 1 Kor 15,4: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ; Mk 8,31; 9,31; 10,34: μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας) liegen⁽⁹⁾; sowie (e) die

⁽⁴⁾ Aufgrund von Offb 11,6 (Regenwunder, Verwandlung von Wasser in Blut, Plagen) ist es z.B. durchaus naheliegend, im Hinblick auf die in den Himmel auffahrenden zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,12) an Elia und Mose zu denken.

⁽⁵⁾ H. SCHMOLDT, "Purim", *Das große Lexikon zur Bibel*. Altes und Neues Testament (eds. K. KOCH – E. OTTO – J. ROLOFF – H. SCHMOLDT) (Wien 2004) 414.

⁽⁶⁾ Vgl. R. BAUCKHAM, *The Climax of Prophecy*. Studies on the Book of Revelation (London 1993) 280.

⁽⁷⁾ W.J. HARRINGTON, *Revelation* (Sacra Pagina Series 16; Collegeville, PA 1993) 121: "[T]heir corpses will lie: ... A recollection of the 'dishonorable' burial of Jesus (Mark 15:46)?"

⁽⁸⁾ HARRINGTON, *Revelation*, 122: "John 16:20 speaks of the joy of 'the world' at Jesus' death; *kosmos* ... is, in the Forth Gospel and 1 John, equivalent to 'the inhabitants of the earth' in Revelation".

⁽⁹⁾ HARRINGTON, *Revelation*, 122: "[F]or three and a half days: ... Recalls the 'three days' of Jesus before resurrection"; BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 280: "John has converted the 'third day' of the Gospel tradition into 'three and a half days'".

Auferstehung⁽¹⁰⁾ und (f) die sich auf einer Wolke vollziehende Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,12) bzw. Jesu (Apg 1,9)⁽¹¹⁾.

Dass die Parallelisierung von Offb 11,7-13 und den neutestamentlichen Berichten über Passion, Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu jedoch problematisch ist, zeigen die berechtigten Einwände, die viele Ausleger diesbezüglich äußern. So wird v.a. kritisch angemerkt, dass die in Offb 11,11 und 1 Kor 15,4 bzw. den Evangelien genannten, jeweils der Auferstehung vorausgehenden, Zeitspannen nicht identisch, sondern vielmehr grundverschieden sind. K. Berger z.B. schreibt: "Die Zeitangabe 'nach dreieinhalb Tagen' stimmt mit keiner Angabe über die Auferweckung Jesu überein und steht besonders zu der alten Formel 'am dritten Tag' in sehr großer Spannung"⁽¹²⁾. U.B. Müllers Kritik fällt ähnlich aus: "Die Wiederbelebung nach dreieinhalb Tagen konkurriert mit der Tradition über die Auferweckung Jesu 'am dritten Tage' ... bzw. 'nach drei Tagen' ..., so daß kaum eine Parallelisierung des Geschicks der beiden Zeugen mit dem Christi beabsichtigt ist"⁽¹³⁾. Auch weist K. Berger darauf hin, dass der Hinrichtungsort der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,8) die einzige explizite "Entsprechung zum Geschick Jesu" ist⁽¹⁴⁾. Er zieht daraus den naheliegenden Schluss, dass "[d]ie Tradenten bzw. Autoren ... keine (weitere) Entsprechung zum Geschick Jesu [haben] darstellen wollen"⁽¹⁵⁾. Außerdem ist zu bedenken, dass Jesus — im Gegensatz zu den zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,9) — gemäß den neutestamentlichen Zeugnissen begraben wurde (vgl. Mt 27,57-60; Mk 15,42-46; Lk 23,50-54; Joh 19,38-42; 1 Kor 15,4), wobei den betreffenden Texten — Mk 15,46 inbegriffen⁽¹⁶⁾ —

⁽¹⁰⁾ JOHNSON, "Revelation", 507: "The two witnesses share in Christ's resurrection".

⁽¹¹⁾ HARRINGTON, *Revelation*, 122: "As it was for their Lord, the resurrection of the witnesses is followed by their ascension; and, like the Lord, 'they went up to heaven in a cloud' (see Acts 1:9);" cf. BAUCKHAM, *Climax*, 280: "The parallel continues with the resurrection and ascension of the witnesses after three and a half days (11:9, 11)".

⁽¹²⁾ K. BERGER, *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohns*. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Deutung des Geschicks Jesu in frühchristlichen Texten (StUNT 13; Göttingen 1976) 39.

⁽¹³⁾ MÜLLER, *Offenbarung*, 215; vgl. GIESEN, *Offenbarung*, 256.

⁽¹⁴⁾ BERGER, *Auferstehung*, 30.

⁽¹⁵⁾ BERGER, *Auferstehung*, 30.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vgl. R.T. FRANCE, *The Gospel of Mark*. A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2002) 669; R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium* (HThK 2/2; Freiburg 2001) II, 515.

nicht zu entnehmen ist, dass es sich dabei um ein unehrenhaftes Begräbnis handelte. So kommentiert L.W. Hurtado Mk 15,46 sogar mit dem Hinweis, dass “[t]he description of Jesus’ burial place suggests that Jesus was buried with respect and by a man of some wealth”⁽¹⁷⁾.

Angesichts solcher Einwände ist festzuhalten, dass nicht nur die jüdischen Parallelen zu Offb 11,7-13, sondern auch die neutestamentlichen Texte über die Passion, Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu nur bedingt als historischer Hintergrund für Offb 11,7-13 in Frage kommen, da sie diese Perikope jeweils nur teilweise erhellen können.

Im vorliegenden Artikel soll mit der römischen *damnatio* bzw. der *consecratio* als deren Gegenstück ein Erklärungsmodell zu Offb 11,7-13 vorgeschlagen werden, mit dem diese Prophetie nicht nur in ihren einzelnen Bestandteilen, sondern in ihrer Gesamtheit gedeutet und in ihren antiken Hintergrund eingeordnet werden kann.

Zunächst wird kurz erläutert, was unter der römischen *damnatio* und *consecratio* zu verstehen ist. Danach werden die zahlreichen Parallelen zwischen Offb 11,7-13 und der *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* herausgestellt. Sodann wird aufgezeigt, dass mit der *damnatio* und *consecratio* der wahrscheinliche historische Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 gefunden ist. Schließlich wird auf Einsichten hingewiesen, die sich aus der *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* als historischem Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 für die Exegese dieser Perikope ergeben.

I. Die römische *damnatio* und *consecratio*

Mit dem modernen⁽¹⁸⁾ Begriff *damnatio* bzw. *damnatio memoriae*⁽¹⁹⁾ bezeichnen Historiker “die Auslöschung der (öffentlichen)

⁽¹⁷⁾ L.W. HURTADO, *Mark* (New International Biblical Commentary; Peabody, MA 1995) 272.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Vgl. H.I. FLOWER, *The Art of Forgetting*. Disgrace & Oblivion in Roman Political Culture (Studies in the History of Greece and Rome; Chapel Hill 2006) xix; S. LINK, “*Damnatio memoriae*”, *Wörterbuch der Antike* (KTA 96; Stuttgart ¹¹2002) 182.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Vgl. FLOWER, *Forgetting*; E.R. VARNER, *Mutilation and Transformation*. *Damnatio memoriae* and Roman Imperial Portraiture (Monumenta Graeca et Romana 10; Leiden 2004); F. VITTINGHOFF, *Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Untersuchungen zur “*damnatio memoriae*” (NDF Alte Geschichte 84; Berlin 1936).

Erinnerung an eine Person (in der Regel eines röm. Kaisers), dessen Name und Bildnisse aus öffentlichen Inschr.[iften] und Bauwerken entfernt werden”⁽²⁰⁾. Auch Münzen waren von der *damnatio memoriae* betroffen⁽²¹⁾.

Im Hinblick auf Offb 11,8-9 ist von besonderem Interesse, dass über die Erasion von Namen und Bildnissen einer Person hinaus auch der Verlust ihres Grabrechts sowie die Feier ihres Todes(tages) Spielarten der *damnatio memoriae* waren. So schreibt F. Vittinghoff: “Diese abolitio memoriae bestand wesentlich in der Vernichtung von Bild und Namen, im Grab- und Trauerverbot, teilweise auch in der Verfluchung des Geburtstages oder der festlichen Feier des Todestages”⁽²²⁾.

Das Gegenstück bzw. die einzige Alternative zur *damnatio memoriae* war die *consecratio*⁽²³⁾, d.h. Vergöttlichung römischer Kaiser, welche auch mit dem synonymen Begriff “Apotheose” (ἀποθέωσις) bezeichnet wird⁽²⁴⁾. P. Zanker schreibt: “Im ausgebauten Principatssystem gab es nur eine Alternative: Anerkennung der Herrschaft eines verstorbenen Princeps durch den Senat mittels der Apotheose oder die Verurteilung seiner Regierung, und das bedeutete *damnatio memoriae*⁽²⁵⁾! Auch von S. Link wird der Gegensatz von *damnatio* und *consecratio* betont: “Wurde ihm [einem römischen Kaiser] nach seinem Ableben die *consecratio* verweigert ..., verurteilte der Senat ihn im senat.[orischen]

⁽²⁰⁾ C. GIZEWSKI, “Damnatio memoriae I”, *Der neue Pauly*. Enzyklopädie der Antike (eds. H. CANKI – H. SCHNEIDER) (Stuttgart 1997) III, 299.

⁽²¹⁾ Vgl. B.A. PASCHKE, “Das verunstaltete Münzportrait des Nero: Spuren einer privaten *damnatio memoriae*?”, *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Numismatischen Gesellschaft* [= *MÖNG*] 47/1 (2007) 16-24; vgl. B.A. PASCHKE, “Die zerkratzte Szenendarstellung auf einem diokletianischen Revers”, *MÖNG* 48/1 (2008) 18-30.

⁽²²⁾ VITTINGHOFF, *Staatsfeind*, 13-14; vgl. VARNER, *Mutilation*, 1; T. MOMMSEN, *Römisches Staatsrecht* (Handbuch der römischen Altertümer 3/2; Graz 1969) 1191; S. BRASSLOFF, “Damnatio memoriae” (PRE 8; Stuttgart 1901) 2059.

⁽²³⁾ Vgl. M. CLAUSS, *Kaiser und Gott*. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich (Stuttgart – Leipzig 1999); H. WREDE, *Consecratio in formam deorum*. Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit (Mainz 1981); P. ZANKER, *Die Apotheose der römischen Kaiser*. Ritual und städtische Bühne (München 2004); H.-J. KLAUCK, *Die religiöse Umwelt des Urchristentums* (KStTh 9/2; Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln 1996) II, 47-48.

⁽²⁴⁾ Vgl. ZANKER, *Apotheose*, 9.

⁽²⁵⁾ ZANKER, *Apotheose*, 36.

Strafprozess unter der Anklage der *perduellio*, des Hochverrats, zur *d.[amnatio] m.[emoriae]*”⁽²⁶⁾. E. Varner bringt diesen Sachverhalt folgendermaßen auf den Punkt: “*Damnatio* is the direct antithesis of *consecratio*”⁽²⁷⁾. In Cass. Dio 60.4.5-6 kommt diese Gegenüberstellung von *damnatio* und *consecratio* besonders deutlich zum Ausdruck:

Gleichwohl verhinderte er [Claudius], als damals der Senat die *damnatio memoriae* für Gaius [ἀτιμῶσαι τὸν Γάϊον] beschließen wollte, persönlich diese Maßnahme, ließ aber auf eigene Verantwortung sämtliche Bildnisse seines Vorgängers bei Nacht entfernen. (6) So kommt es, daß der Name des Gaius in der Liste der Kaiser, deren wir bei unseren Eiden und Gebeten gedenken [ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων ὧν μνήμην ἐπὶ τε τοῖς ὅρκοις καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς ποιούμεθα⁽²⁸⁾], ebensowenig wie der des Tiberius erscheint; und doch ist keiner der beiden Herrscher auf Grund eines offiziellen Beschlusses geächtet [ἀτιμίαν]⁽²⁹⁾.

Grundlage der *consecratio* war “die in der röm.-hell. Welt verbreitete rel. Annahme, verdiente Herrscherpersönlichkeiten kämen, wie Heroen, aus der Götterwelt und kehrten nach dem Tod wieder dorthin zurück”⁽³⁰⁾. Im Hinblick auf die Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,12) ist darauf hinzuweisen, dass auch die *consecratio* als “Himmelfahrt aufzufassen ist”⁽³¹⁾. So beschreibt H. Le Bonniec das Zeremoniell einer ἀποθέωσις/*consecratio* folgendermaßen: “[V]om Holzstoß aus, worauf die Leiche des Kaisers verbrannt wurde, ließ man einen Adler frei, der die Seele des Verstorbenen mit sich nehmen sollte; ein Zeuge bestätigte, daß er den Geist des Kaisers hatte in den Himmel steigen sehen. Der Kaiser erhielt, nachdem ihn ein Dekret des Senats als Gott anerkannt hatte, den Titel *divus* und wurde Gegenstand eines posthumen Kults”⁽³²⁾.

Laut M. Clauss waren “[d]as Verbrennen und das Aufsteigen der Flammen ... geradezu konstitutiv für die ‘Himmelfahrt’, so daß eine

⁽²⁶⁾ LINK, “*Damnatio*”, 182.

⁽²⁷⁾ VARNER, *Mutilation*, 6.

⁽²⁸⁾ Vgl. CLAUSS, *Kaiser und Gott*, 374-376: Laut M. Clauss handelt es sich hierbei um eine Liste der konsekrierten, d.h. unter die Staatsgötter erhobenen Kaiser.

⁽²⁹⁾ Altgriechisch: *Dio's Roman History*, Bd. 7 (LCL 175; London – Cambridge, MA 1968) 376; deutsch: Cassius Dio, *Römische Geschichte* (BAW.GR; Zürich – München 1986) IV, 430; vgl. auch App. Civ. 2.148.

⁽³⁰⁾ GIZEWSKI, “*Damnatio memoriae* I”, 299.

⁽³¹⁾ Z.B. ZANKER, *Apotheose*, 8, 12, 58.

⁽³²⁾ H. Le BONNIEC, “*Apotheose*” (LAW; Zürich 1965) 227.

andere Art als die Verbrennung für Kaiser nicht in Frage kommt”⁽³³⁾. Die im Zusammenhang mit der *consecratio* verwendete Adler-Ikonografie findet sich z.B. auch auf dem Ende des 1. Jh. n. Chr. errichteten Titusbogen in Rom. Hier ist in der Innenseite der *divus Titus* dargestellt, der auf den Flügeln eines Adlers in den Himmel emporsteigt⁽³⁴⁾.

II. Parallelen zwischen der *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* und Offb 11,7-13

1. Parallelen zwischen der *damnatio* und Offb 11,7-10

Es wurde oben (Anm. 1) bereits darauf hingewiesen, dass D.E. Aune als einziger Ausleger nicht nur jüdische, sondern auch griechisch-römische Parallelen zu Offb 11,7-13 angibt. Im Hinblick auf die in Offb 11,8-9 vorausgesagte ausbleibende Bestattung der zwei Zeugen führt er jedoch im Wesentlichen Parallelen aus der (homerischen) *Ilias* und *Odyssee* an⁽³⁵⁾. Römische Parallelen nennt er nicht. In Bezug auf die u.a. durch Geschenke zum Ausdruck kommende Freude (Offb 11,10) nennt er nicht nur Passagen aus der *Ilias* und *Odyssee*, sondern auch die römischen Saturnalien⁽³⁶⁾. Somit kann festgehalten werden, dass D.E. Aune die in Offb 11,8-10 vorausgesagten Ereignisse *nicht* mit der römischen *damnatio memoriae* in Verbindung bringt.

Dass diese Verbindung aber durchaus hergestellt werden kann, soll nun anhand von literarischen Quellen aus der Antike aufgezeigt werden⁽³⁷⁾. Im Haupttext werden in chronologischer Reihenfolge die Fälle von *damnatio memoriae* angeführt, bei denen — wie in Offb 11,8-9 — sowohl das Ausbleiben der Bestattung bzw. Leichenschändung als auch die Freude über den Tod eine Rolle spielte. Als Ergänzung dazu wird in kleinerer Schrift auf *damnatio-memoriae*-Fälle hingewiesen, bei denen m.W. lediglich eines dieser beiden Elemente bezeugt ist.

⁽³³⁾ CLAUSS, *Kaiser und Gott*, 363 Anm. 41; vgl. 363: “[D]as mit der Verbrennung sichtbar gemachte Aufsteigen in den Himmel.”

⁽³⁴⁾ Vgl. CLAUSS, *Kaiser und Gott*, 365.

⁽³⁵⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 622.

⁽³⁶⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 623.

⁽³⁷⁾ Z.T. wird der altgriechische bzw. lateinische Wortlaut in eckigen Klammern in die deutsche Übersetzung der jeweiligen Texte eingefügt.

Dem Prätor Marcus Scribonius Libo wurde unter Kaiser Tiberius (14-37 n. Chr.) der Majestätsprozess gemacht, vor dessen Ende er sich 16 n. Chr. das Leben nahm. Die anschließende *damnatio memoriae* beschreibt Tacitus mit folgenden Worten: "Sein Vermögen wurde unter die Ankläger verteilt und die Prätur außer der Reihe denen verliehen, die dem Senatorenstand angehörten. Dann beantragte Cotta Messalinus, das Bild Libos solle bei Leichenbegängnissen seiner Nachkommen, nicht mitgeführt werden, Cn. Lentulus, kein Scribonier solle mehr den Beinamen Drusus annehmen dürfen. Tage für Dankfeste wurden auf Antrag des Pomponius Flaccus festgesetzt; Geschenke [*dona*] dem Iuppiter, dem Mars, der Concordia darzubringen und den Tag der Iden des September, an dem sich Libo das Leben genommen hatte, zum Festtag [*dies festus*] zu erklären, beantragten L. Plancus, Gallus Asinius, Papius Mutlus und L. Apronius" (Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1-2)⁽³⁸⁾.

Zur *damnatio memoriae* des 31 n. Chr. unter Tiberius hingerichteten Gardepräфекten Seianus⁽³⁹⁾ schreibt Cassius Dio: "Daraufhin wurde er [Seianus] hingerichtet, die Leiche aber die Treppe [τῶν ἀναβασμῶν⁽⁴⁰⁾] heruntergeworfen, wo sie der Pöbel drei ganze Tage [τρισὶν ὅλαις ἡμέραις⁽⁴¹⁾] schändete, und schließlich im Flusse versenkt" (Cass. Dio 58.11.5)⁽⁴²⁾. Etwas weiter unten heißt es dann: "Außerdem sollte unter Leitung aller Behörden und Priester ... ein Fest abgehalten und der Todestag des Seianus alljährlich durch Pferderennen und Tierhetzen ... gefeiert werden" (Cass. Dio 58.12.5)⁽⁴³⁾.

Ähnliche Parallelen finden sich im suetonischen Bericht über die *damnatio memoriae* des ermordeten (vgl. Suet. *Cal.* 58) Gaius/Caligula (37-41 n. Chr.). So informiert Sueton seine Leser über das Ausbleiben einer ordnungsgemäßen Bestattung des

⁽³⁸⁾ P. Cornelius Tacitus, *Annalen*. Lateinisch und deutsch (Sammlung Tusculum; München – Zürich 1982) 142-143.

⁽³⁹⁾ Vgl. VITTINGHOFF, *Staatsfeind*, 47 Anm. 214.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Vgl. K. ZIEGLER, "Gemoniae scalae" (PRE 13; Stuttgart 1910) 1115: "Gemoniae scalae ..., gewöhnlich nur *Gemoniae* ... heißt die Treppe, auf welche die hingerichteten Verbrecher von den Henkern an einem Haken geschleift, dort eine Zeit lang liegen gelassen und der öffentlichen Beschimpfung preisgegeben ... und endlich von da abermals am Haken in den Tiber geschleift wurden ... Cass. Dio ..., der ... stets nur, ohne Nennung des Namens G. von den ἀναβασμοί spricht".

⁽⁴¹⁾ Vgl. die Zeitspanne ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἡμισυ in Offb 11,9; Näheres dazu unten in Anm. 57.

⁽⁴²⁾ Altgriechisch: Dio's *Roman History*, Bd. 7, 216; deutsch: CASSIUS DIO, *Römische Geschichte*, Bd. 4, 352.

⁽⁴³⁾ Cassius Dio, *Römische Geschichte*, IV, 353-354.

Imperators: "Seinen Leichnam brachte man heimlich in die Gärten des Lamia; dort wurde er auf einem in größter Eile errichteten Scheiterhaufen nur halb verbrannt und dann nur oberflächlich mit Rasenstücken abgedeckt [*levi caespite obrutum est*]. Später ließen seine Schwestern nach ihrer Rückkehr aus der Verbannung die Reste ausgraben, einäschern und beisetzen [*sepultumque*]" (Suet. *Cal.* 59)⁽⁴⁴⁾. Suetons Abhandlung über Caligulas Nachfolger Claudius (41-54 n. Chr.) ist dann zu entnehmen, dass zudem eine alljährliche Feier von Caligulas Todestag zumindest in Erwägung gezogen wurde: "Auch wenn er [Claudius] die Erlasse des Gaius allesamt für ungültig erklären ließ, verbot er dennoch, seinen Todestag unter die Festtage aufzunehmen [*diem tamen necis ... vetuit inter festos referri*], und das obwohl doch mit diesem Tag seine Regierungszeit begann" (Suet. *Claud.* 11.3)⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Dass sich das Volk über den Tod von Kaiser Nero (54-68 n. Chr.) sehr freute, wird in Suet. *Nero* 57.1 berichtet: "Und die Freude über seinen [Neros] Tod war so groß, daß das Volk mit Freiheitsmützen auf dem Kopf durch die ganze Stadt lief [*tantumque gaudium publice prae-buit, ut plebs pilleata tota urbe discurreret*]"⁽⁴⁶⁾. Daneben ist dem mit einer offiziellen *damnatio memoriae* belegten Imperator keine standesgemäße Bestattung zuteil geworden. J. Malitz schreibt: "Als 'Staatsfeind' konnte Nero nicht im Mausoleum des Augustus bestattet werden"⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Über die Hinrichtung und anschließende *damnatio memoriae* von Kaiser Vitellius (69 n. Chr.) schreibt Sueton: "Zuletzt wurde er bei den Gemonien durch lauter kleine Stiche zu Tode gefoltert und nach seinem Tod auch noch mit einem Haken in den Tiber geschleift" (Suet. *Vit.* 17.2)⁽⁴⁸⁾. Dass die Leiche des Vitellius bei dieser Gelegenheit auch zur Schau gestellt bzw. geschändet wurde, geht aus dem entsprechenden Bericht des Tacitus hervor: "[S]chließlich stieß man ihn [Vitellius] vor sich her zur Seufzertreppe, wo der Leichnam des Flavius Sabinus gelegen hatte ... Die Schlechtigkeit, mit welcher

(⁴⁴) C. Suetonius Tranquillus, *Die Kaiserviten / Berühmte Männer, Lateinisch/Deutsch* (Sammlung Tuscolum; Düsseldorf – Zürich 2000) 536-537.

(⁴⁵) Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 560-561.

(⁴⁶) Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 730-731.

(⁴⁷) J. MALITZ, *Nero* (München 1999) 113.

(⁴⁸) Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 822-823; vgl. Suet. *Tib.* 53.

der Pöbel sich an dem Toten vergriff, war ebenso arg wie die verwerflichen Huldigung für den Lebenden" (Tac. *Hist.* 3.85)⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Im Zusammenhang der *damnatio memoriae* des ermordeten (vgl. Suet. *Dom.* 17.3; 23.1) Domitian (81-96 n.Chr.) spielte die Freude über seinen Tod eine Rolle. Sueton schreibt: "Die Senatoren ... waren so froh [*senatus adeo laetatus est*], daß sie um die Wette ins Rathaus liefen und nicht an sich halten konnten, den toten Kaiser mit den schmachvollsten und bittersten Beschimpfungen zu verunglimpfen" (Suet. *Dom.* 23.1)⁽⁵⁰⁾. Auch Plinius der Jüngere berichtet in seiner Lobrede auf Trajan von der Freude anlässlich des Todes bzw. der *damnatio memoriae* Domitians: "Jene zahllosen Goldstatuen aber sind gestürzt und geborsten, begleitet vom Jubel des Volkes [*publico gaudio*]. Welche Freude [*Iuvabat*], die Köpfe mit dem hoffärtigem Gesichtsausdruck zu Boden zu schmettern ... Keiner konnte seinen Jubel [*gaudii*], seine lang ersehnte Freude [*laetitia*] unterdrücken, jedem galt es als Rache, die zerhauenen Glieder und verstümmelten Körper zu betrachten" (Plin. Minor, *Paneg.* 52, 4-5)⁽⁵¹⁾. Dass Domitian eine ehrenvolle, römische Bestattung verwehrt wurde, geht aus den folgenden Worten des Sueton hervor: "Sein Leichnam wurde auf einer einfachen Bahre [*populari sandapila*] von Leichenträgern hinausgetragen, und seine Amme Phyllis feierte auf ihrem Landgut ... seine Leichenfeier. Seine Überreste brachte sie heimlich [*clam intulit*] in den Tempel des flavischen Geschlechts und vermischte sie mit der Asche der Iulia, der Tochter des Titus, die sie auch aufgezogen hatte" (Suet. *Dom.* 17.3)⁽⁵²⁾.

Da sich zum Schicksal der zwei Zeugen auch im suetonischen Bericht über Tiberius (14-37 n.Chr.) beachtenswerte Parallelen finden, sollen diese nun schließlich vorgestellt werden, obwohl Tiberius nicht das Opfer einer offiziellen *damnatio memoriae* wurde. Sueton berichtet davon, dass das Volk (a) sich über den Tod des Tiberius freute und (b) verlangte, seine Leiche solle geschändet bzw. nicht ordnungsgemäß bestattet werden: "Darüber, daß er [Tiberius] tot war, freute sich das Volk so sehr, daß man in alle Himmelsrichtungen auseinanderlief, sobald man von seinem Tod erfahren hatte, und einige

⁽⁴⁹⁾ P. Cornelius Tacitus, *Historiae*. Lateinisch-deutsch (Sammlung Tusculum; München – Zürich 1984) 370-371.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 926-927; vgl. VARNER, *Mutilation*, 111.132.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Plinius der Jüngere, *Panegyrikus*. Lobrede auf den Kaiser Trajan (Darmstadt 1985) 102-103; vgl. CLAUSS, *Kaiser und Gott*, 384-385.

⁽⁵²⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 920-921.

den Ruf anstimmten: 'Tiberius in den Tiber!'" (Suet. *Tib.* 75.1)⁽⁵³⁾. Weiter unten ist dann zu lesen: "Als sich der Leichenzug von Miseum aus in Bewegung zu setzen begann, wurde von vielen Seiten die Forderung laut, man solle ihn [Tiberius] lieber nach Atella bringen und im Amphitheater halb verbrennen" (Suet. *Tib.* 75.3)⁽⁵⁴⁾. Zu diesem Abschnitt schreibt H. Martinet in seinen Erläuterungen: "[D]ies [ist] eine Verhöhnung des toten Princeps. Statt einer ehrenvollen Bestattung in Rom wird gefordert, ihn diese unbedeutende Kleinstadt [Atella] zu bringen, um ihn dort in der Arena, in der sonst Verbrecher durch Verbrennung hingerichtet wurden, dem Feuer zu übergeben"⁽⁵⁵⁾.

In Anbetracht der hier untersuchten Primärquellen lässt sich zusammenfassend sagen, dass die folgenden Elemente des Schicksals der zwei Zeugen so (oder ähnlich) auch im Zusammenhang der römischen *damnatio memoriae* vorkamen: (a) vorausgehende Ermordung bzw. Hinrichtung⁽⁵⁶⁾, (b) Zur-Schau-Stellung der Leichen⁽⁵⁷⁾, (c) Verwehrung der Bestattung⁽⁵⁸⁾ und (d) allgemeine Freude über den Todesfall⁽⁵⁹⁾ bzw. Feier des Todes(tages)⁽⁶⁰⁾, wobei in den antiken Zeugnissen zur *damnatio memoriae* das Verteilen von Geschenken⁽⁶¹⁾ (vgl. Offb 11,10) nicht erwähnt wird. So schrieb H.I.

⁽⁵³⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 435-437; vgl. 434 (lateinischer Wortlaut): *Morte eius ita laetatus est populus, ut ad primum nuntium discurrentes pars: "Tiberium in Tiberim!" clamarent.*

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 437.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 1113.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Vgl. die Ermordung/Hinrichtung der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,7) mit der Ermordung/Hinrichtung von Seianus (Cass. Dio 58.11.5), Caligula (Suet. *Cal.* 58) und Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 17.3; 23.1).

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Vgl. Offb 11,8-9 mit Tac. *Hist.* 3.85 und Cass. Dio 58.11.5. Da es sich bei den in Cass. Dio 58.11.5 erwähnten "drei ganzen Tagen" im Gegensatz zu den Worten "am dritten Tage" (1 Kor 15,4) wohl *nicht* um eine feststehende Formel handelte, kann die Zeitangabe in der Cassiusstelle – anders als die in 1 Kor 15,4 – als Parallele zu den in Offb 11,9 genannten "dreieinhalb Tagen" aufgefasst werden.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Vgl. Offb 11,9b mit (a) Cass. Dio 58.11.5 und Suet. *Tib.* 75.1 (Versenken des Leichnams im Fluss), (b) Suet. *Cal.* 59 und Suet. *Tib.* 75.3 (unvollständige Verbrennung und oberflächliche Bestattung des Leichnams) und (c) Suet. *Dom.* 17.3 (Verwehrung einer ehrenvollen Bestattung).

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Vgl. die in Offb 11,10 betonte Freude (χαίρω, εὐφραίνω) mit der Freude, die in Suet. *Dom.* 23.1 (*laetatus*); *Tib.* 75.1 (*laetatus*); *Nero* 57.1 (*gaudium*) und Plin. minor, *Paneg.* 52, 4-5 (*publico gaudio; iuvabat; gaudii; laetitiae*) erwähnt wird.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Siehe Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1-2; Cass. Dio 58.12.5 und Suet. *Claud.* 11.3.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Vgl. A. STUIBER, "Geschenk" (RAC 10; Stuttgart 1978) 685-703; K.-W. WEEBER, "Geschenke II. Rom", *Der Neue Pauly*. Enzyklopädie der Antike (eds.

Flower (Princeton) auf meine Frage hin, ob sich die alten Römer im Rahmen ehrenmindernder Todestags-Feierlichkeiten gegenseitig beschenken: "Ich glaube nicht, daß wir irgendwelche Informationen über Geschenke haben. Man kann es natürlich nicht ganz ausschließen, aber es sieht m.E. nicht sehr wahrscheinlich aus" ⁽⁶²⁾.

Man vergleiche im Gegensatz zu den gerade angeführten Parallelen die öffentliche Trauer und ehrenvolle Bestattung ⁽⁶³⁾, die den nicht durch eine *damnatio memoriae* bestraften, sondern konsekrierten römischen Kaisern des 1. Jh. n. Chr. (z.B. Augustus, Claudius und Titus) zuteil wurden (vgl. Suet. *Aug.* 100.2-4; *Claud.* 45; *Titus* 11; vgl. auch App. *Civ.* 2.148). Im betreffenden suetonischen Bericht über den *divus Claudius* (41-54 n. Chr.) heißt es z.B.: "Bestattet wurde er in dem für die Kaiser üblichen prachtvollen Rahmen, und er wurde unter die Götter erhoben" (Suet. *Claud.* 45) ⁽⁶⁴⁾.

2. Parallelen zwischen der consecratio und Offb 11,11-13

In diesem Paragraphen soll es um die Parallelität zwischen Offb 11,11-13 und der römischen *consecratio* gehen ⁽⁶⁵⁾. Auf diese Parallelität hat bereits D.E. Aune in seinem Kommentar zur in Offb 11,12 vorhergesagten, von den Umstehenden bezeugten Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen hingewiesen: "The same motif occurs in the Greco-Roman accounts of apotheosis or divinization through ascension to heaven" ⁽⁶⁶⁾. Als römische Beispiele nennt er die berichteten Himmelfahrten von Romulus, Caesar und Augustus ⁽⁶⁷⁾. Im Folgenden sollen die Parallelen zwischen Offb 11,11-13 und der römischen *consecratio* anhand von literarischen Quellen aus der Antike näher erläutert werden. In Bezug auf die *consecratio* Julius Caesars ist bei Sueton folgendes zu lesen:

H. CANKIK – H. SCHNEIDER) (Stuttgart – Weimar 1998) IV, 988-989; LINK, "Geschenke", *Wörterbuch*, 310.

⁽⁶²⁾ Email vom 11. Juni 2008; vgl. aber Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.2. Aus diesem Text geht hervor, dass man im antiken Rom anlässlich des Todes eines ungeliebten Menschen zumindest den Göttern Geschenke machte.

⁽⁶³⁾ CLAUS, *Kaiser und Gott*, 361-365: "Staatsbegräbnis".

⁽⁶⁴⁾ *Funeratusque est sollemni principum pompa et in numerum deorum relatus.*

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Auf Unterschiede zwischen Offb 11,11-13 und der römischen *consecratio* wird unten (IV.3) eingegangen.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 626-627.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 627.

Caesar starb im Alter von sechsundfünfzig Jahren und wurde unter die Götter erhoben [*atque in deorum numerum relatus est*]. Und das geschah nicht nur mit breiter Zustimmung der zuständigen Instanz, sondern auch weil das Volk dieser Meinung war. Ja, während der Spiele, die Augustus am ersten Jahrestag für den unter die Götter erhobenen Caesar veranstaltete [*quos primo(s) consecrato[s] ei heres Augustus edebat*], strahlte ein Komet [*stella crinita*] sieben Tage nacheinander am Himmel ... und man glaubte, es sei die Seele des in den Himmel aufgenommenen Caesar [*creditumque est animam esse Caesaris in caelum recepti*] (Suet. *Caes.* 88)⁽⁶⁸⁾.

Über die *consecratio* des Augustus (27 v. Chr. – 14 n.Chr.) ist dann bei Sueton folgendes zu lesen: “Und da gab es auch einen Mann von Rang eines Praetors, der schwor, daß er gesehen habe, wie das Abbild des Verbrannten in den Himmel aufgestiegen sei [*qui se effigiem cremati euntem in caelum vidisse iurare*]” (Suet. *Aug.* 100.4)⁽⁶⁹⁾. Übereinstimmend wird in Cass. Dio 56.46.2 davon berichtet, dass ein gewisser Numerius Atticus, ein Senator und ehemaliger Prätor, schwor, Augustus in den Himmel aufsteigen gesehen zu haben⁽⁷⁰⁾.

Wie in Offb 11,12 — das Stichwort οὐρανός fällt in diesem Vers zweimal — geht es auch bei der römischen *consecratio* um einen Aufstieg zum οὐρανός (Cass. Dio 56.56.2) bzw. *caelum* (Suet. *Caes.* 88; *Aug.* 100.4). Sowohl in Offb 11,12 als auch in den antiken Paralleltexten wird ausdrücklich betont, dass der Aufstieg zum Himmel einem Eingang in die göttliche Welt gleichkommt (Suet. *Caes.* 88).

D.E. Aune weist darauf hin, dass nicht nur die vorhergesagte Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen von einem Naturphänomen (d.h. Erdbeben) begleitet werden soll (Offb 11,13), sondern bisweilen auch römische Konsekrationen mit außerordentlichen Naturereignissen einhergingen: “In legendary narratives, the ascension of heroes is often accompanied by atmospheric and seismic phenomena; in the case of Romulus there was an eclipse, thunder, lightning, and rain (Dionysius Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.56.2; Plutarch *Rom.* 27.6; Ovid *Metam.* 14.816-17; Dio 1.5.12)”⁽⁷¹⁾. Der mit dem konsekrierten Caesar in Verbindung gebrachte Komet (Suet. *Caes.* 88) ist ein weiterer Beleg für die Richtigkeit dieser Feststellung.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 138-139.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Suetonius, *Kaiserviten*, 314-315.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ *Dio's Roman History*, VII, 104: ... τὸν Αὐγουστον ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν, κατὰ τὰ περὶ τε τοῦ Πρόκλου καὶ περὶ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου λεγόμενα, ἀνιόντα ἑορακέναι ὤμοσε.

⁽⁷¹⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 627.

Zusammenfassend ist festzuhalten, dass die in diesem Abschnitt behandelten antiken literarischen Zeugnisse über die römische *damnatio* (II.1) und *consecratio* (II.2) erstaunliche Parallelen zu den in Offb 11,7-13 vorausgesagten Ereignissen enthalten. Im folgenden Abschnitt soll aufgezeigt werden, dass *damnatio* und *consecratio* als historischer Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 in Erwägung zu ziehen sind.

III. Die *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* als historischer Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13

In diesem Abschnitt sollen die Argumente für die *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* als historischen Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 angeführt werden, wobei mit der Mehrheit der Exegeten davon ausgegangen wird, dass die Johannesoffenbarung in der Regierungszeit Domitians (81-96 n. Chr.) verfasst wurde⁽⁷²⁾. Die Frage, um die es geht, ist folgende: Was spricht dafür, dass der Autor der Apokalypse die in Offb 11,7-13 gemachten Voraussagen in bewusster Anlehnung an die römische *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* formuliert bzw. gestaltet hat?

Als erstes Argument ist die weite Verbreitung bzw. der hohe Bekanntheitsgrad der *damnatio* und *consecratio* im gesamten römischen Reich zu nennen. Beide Maßnahmen betrafen v.a. Kaiser, d.h. Personen des öffentlichen Lebens. Somit ist davon auszugehen, dass sich die *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* eines Kaisers schnell im römischen Imperium herumsprach bzw. durch literarische, epigraphische und numismatische Quellen bekannt gemacht wurde.

Für die *damnatio* und *consecratio* als historischen Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 spricht zweitens, dass diese zusammen gehörenden und daher eine Einheit bildenden (vgl. Cass. Dio 60.4.5-6; App. Civ. 2.148)⁽⁷³⁾ römischen Maßnahmen dem Autor der Johannesoffenbarung — im Gegensatz zu sowohl (a) den aus verschiedenen Kontexten und Epochen stammenden jüdischen Parallelen als auch (b) den neutestamentlichen Texten über die Passion, Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu — ein umfassendes und kohärentes antikes

⁽⁷²⁾ Vgl. I. BROER, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament: Studienausgabe* (Würzburg 2006) 672; eine gute Übersicht über alle Datierungsvorschläge findet sich neuerdings in T. WITULSKI, *Die Johannesoffenbarung und Kaiser Hadrian: Studien zur Datierung der neutestamentlichen Apokalypse* (FRLANT 221; Göttingen 2007) 14-52.

⁽⁷³⁾ Vgl. ferner VARNER, *Mutilation*, 1: "Damnatio is the direct antithesis of consecratio."

Erklärungsraaster für Offb 11,7-13 boten. Um es mit einer Formulierung von M. Frenschowski zu sagen: In den in Abschnitt II präsentierten Zeugnissen zur römischen *damnatio* und *consecratio* findet man ein "Nebeneinander von Zügen, die stark an Apk 11 erinnern"⁽⁷⁴⁾. Ausleger haben zu Recht auf den zum Ausdruck gebrachten Kontrast zwischen Offb 11,7-10 und 11,11-13 hingewiesen"⁽⁷⁵⁾. Es ist gut denkbar, dass der Autor der Apokalypse diesen Kontrast bewusst in Anlehnung an den Kontrast zwischen *damnatio* und *consecratio* gestaltet hat.

Drittens sind *damnatio* und *consecratio* aufgrund ihres römischen und somit heidnischen Charakters den jüdischen Parallelen als antiker Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 vorzuziehen⁽⁷⁶⁾.

Durch die Erwähnung von (a) Sodom (Offb 11,8), (b) Ägypten (Offb 11,8), (c) den Menschen ἐκ τῶν λαῶν καὶ φυλῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ ἔθνων (Offb 11,9) sowie (d) den οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Offb 11,10) werden die Gegner der zwei Zeugen in erster Linie als Heiden präsentiert. So schreibt A.F. Johnson, dass "the pagan world will celebrate the destruction of the two witnesses and the victory over them"⁽⁷⁷⁾. Und T. Zahn redet von "unzweideutigen Angaben in Ap 11,2.8-9 über die Heiden als Herren und Gebieter in der ganzen Stadt Jerusalem"⁽⁷⁸⁾. Aufgrund der v.a. heidnischen Identität der Gegner der zwei Zeugen kam die spezifisch römische/heidnische *damnatio* dem Autor der Johannesoffenbarung als Rahmen von Offb 11,8-10 wohl sehr gelegen. Unwahrscheinlich dagegen ist, dass er die heidnischen Feierlichkeiten anlässlich des Todes der zwei Zeugen mit (a) den Feierlichkeiten anlässlich der Verlesung des mosaischen Gesetzes (Neh 8,12) oder (b) dem jüdischen Purimfest (Est 9,19) in Verbindung brachte bzw. bringen wollte.

Viertens steht der spezifisch römische Charakter der *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* im Einklang mit der exegetischen Mehrheits-

⁽⁷⁴⁾ M. FRENSCHOWSKI, "Die Entrückung der zwei Zeugen zum Himmel (Apk 11,11-14)", JAC 10 (2005) 275; M. Frenschowski bezieht sich hier auf die Parallelität zwischen Offb 11 und der (wohl davon abhängigen) koptischen Elia-Apokalypse aus dem späten 3. Jh. n. Chr.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Vgl. z.B. MÜLLER, *Offenbarung*, 215: "Kontrast zwischen dem anfänglichen Jubel der Erdenbewohner und ihrer Furcht und Betroffenheit danach."

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Vgl. jedoch AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 622: In Ps 79,1-3 geht es ebenfalls um eine von Heiden (vgl. LXX Ps 78,1: ἔθνη) vollzogene Schändung der Leichen der Knechte Gottes.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ A.F. JOHNSON, "Revelation" (EBC 12; Grand Rapids, MI 1981) 507.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ T. ZAHN, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Wuppertal 1986) 422.

meinung, dass die Johannesapokalypse sowohl (a) die Existenz des römischen Kaiserkults⁽⁷⁹⁾ als auch (b) die — evtl. daraus sich ergebende — Verfolgung der Christen vonseiten des römischen Reiches⁽⁸⁰⁾ widerspiegelt⁽⁸¹⁾. Der Autor der Offenbarung hätte somit in Form der *damnatio memoriae* folgerichtig bewusst eine römische Maßnahme als Vorbild für die vorausgesagte Ermordung bzw. die sich daran anschließende Entehrung der zwei Zeugen gewählt.

Das fünfte und letzte Argument wird voraussichtlich nur von Exegeten positiv aufgenommen werden, die weder von Jerusalem⁽⁸²⁾ (vgl. Offb 11,8: ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη) noch von einer fiktiven Stadt⁽⁸³⁾, sondern von Rom als Schauplatz der in Offb 11,7-13 vorausgesagten Ereignisse ausgehen⁽⁸⁴⁾ bzw. Offenheit für Rom als Schauplatz signalisieren⁽⁸⁵⁾. Als Argumente für Rom als Schauplatz der in Offb 11,7-13 vorhergesagten Ereignisse wird vor allem darauf hingewiesen, dass (a) die Bezeichnung μεγάλη πόλις (Offb 11,8) in der Offenbarung ansonsten nur für Rom gebraucht wird (vgl. Offb 17,18; 18,10.16.18.19.21; vgl. 16,19)⁽⁸⁶⁾ und (b) die Anwesenheit internationaler Menschenmassen besser zu Rom als zu Jerusalem passt⁽⁸⁷⁾. Falls der Autor der Offenbarung tatsächlich Rom — und das würde aufgrund von ἡ πλατεῖα in Offb 11,8 wahrscheinlich gleichzeitig bedeuteten: das *Forum Romanum*⁽⁸⁸⁾ — als Schauplatz von Offb 11,7-13 vor Augen

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Vgl. Offb 13,4.12.15-16; 14,9.11; 15,2; 16,2; 19,20; 20,4.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ Vgl. Offb 1,9; 2,10.13; 3,10; 6,9; 17,6; 18,24; 19,2; vgl. auch Offb 17,9.18 (sieben Hügel Roms).

⁽⁸¹⁾ Vgl. z.B. L. MORRIS, *The Book of Revelation* (TNTC; Leicester – Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 35-41; R.H. MOUNCE, *The Book of Revelation* (NIC; Grand Rapids, MI 1983) 32-34.

⁽⁸²⁾ Vgl. z.B. AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 619; R.H. CHARLES, *The Revelation of St. John* (ICC; Edinburgh 1985) I, 288; J.M. FORD, *Revelation* (AB 38; Garden City, NY 1984) 180; MÜLLER, *Offenbarung*, 213; M. OBERWEIS, "Das Martyrium der Zebedaiden in Mk 10.35-40 (Mt 20.20-3) und Offb 11.3-13", *NTS* 44 (1998) 82: "[D]ie große Stadt, 'wo auch ihr Herr gekreuzigt wurde', kann nur Jerusalem meinen".

⁽⁸³⁾ Vgl. z.B. MORRIS, *Revelation*, 146; P.E. HUGHES, *The Book of the Revelation. A Commentary* (Leicester – Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 127.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ Vgl. z.B. G.B. CAIRD, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (BNTC; London 1984) 138; MOUNCE, *Revelation*, 226.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 618.620; JOHNSON, "Revelation", 506; E. LOHSE, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (NTD 11; Göttingen 1971) 66.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ Vgl. AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 619.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 621.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 618: "[T]he chief public square at Rome was the *Forum Romanum*".

hatte, ist es naheliegend, anzunehmen, dass er die römische *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* als Muster bzw. Raster für die vorausgesagten Ereignisse wählte.

Die zu Anfang dieses Abschnittes gestellte Frage lässt sich somit zusammenfassend folgendermaßen beantworten: Es wäre gut denkbar, dass der Autor der Johannesoffenbarung die in Offb 11,7-13 gemachten Voraussagen in bewusster Anlehnung an die römische *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* formuliert und gestaltet hat, weil diese römischen Maßnahmen (a) einen hohen Bekanntheitsgrad im römischen Reich hatten, (b) ihm ein umfassendes und kohärentes Erklärungsmodell für Offb 11,7-13 boten, (c) heidnischen Charakters waren und gut zu sowohl (d) der römischen Christenverfolgung als auch (e) Rom als — eventuellem — Schauplatz von Offb 11,7-13 passten.

IV. Exegetische Einsichten

Nachdem im vorausgehenden Abschnitt aufgezeigt wurde, dass römische *damnatio* und *consecratio* als historischer Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 in Frage kommen, soll es nun schließlich noch um einige Einsichten gehen, die sich aus diesem historischen Hintergrund für die Exegese dieser Perikope ergeben.

1. *Rom und das Forum Romanum als Schauplatz von Offb 11,7-13*

Ausleger, die bisher von Jerusalem oder einer fiktiven Stadt als Schauplatz der in Offb 11,7-13 vorhergesagten Geschehnisse ausgegangen sind und von den (bzw. einigen der) im dritten Abschnitt angeführten Argumenten⁽⁸⁹⁾ von der *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* als historischem Hintergrund von Offb 11,7-13 überzeugt wurden, könnten nun diesen spezifisch römischen Hintergrund zum Anlass dafür nehmen, Rom bzw. — Aufgrund der Erwähnung von ἡ πλατεῖα in Offb 11,8 — das *Forum Romanum*⁽⁹⁰⁾ als Schauplatz der entsprechenden Ereignisse in Erwägung zu ziehen.

Zum *Forum Romanum* als Schauplatz passt auch, dass dieses in der Kaiserzeit laut offiziellem Reiseführer zum “Ort der Vergöttlichung

⁽⁸⁹⁾ Argument (e) ist hiervon auszunehmen, da dies sonst zu einem Zirkelschluss führen würde.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Vgl. AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 618, 620.

des Kaisers *post mortem*“⁽⁹¹⁾ wurde. Dass hier speziell auch Himmelfahrten inschriftlich bezeugt waren bzw. stattgefunden haben sollen, machen der Titusbogen (s.o. I) und — eventuell — der *lapis niger*⁽⁹²⁾ deutlich.

Dass der Schauplatz *Forum Romanum* dem Autor der Johannesoffenbarung nicht nur im Hinblick auf die Himmelfahrt, sondern auch auf die Leichenschändung der zwei Zeugen als naheliegend erschien, wird deutlich, wenn man aufgrund von Cass. Dio 58.5.6 mit K. Ziegler davon ausgeht, dass die sog. Gemonien (s.o. II.1) wahrscheinlich unmittelbar an das *Forum* angrenzten und evtl. mit der heutigen *Via S. Pietro in Carcere* gleichzusetzen sind⁽⁹³⁾. Trotz dieser Überlegungen zugunsten des *Forum Romanum* ist Jerusalem aufgrund der Bemerkung ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη (Offb 11,8) m.E. jedoch der wahrscheinlichere Schauplatz der in Offb 11,7-3 vorausgesagten Ereignisse.

2. Die Verantwortung und Schuld der Heiden

Es wurde bereits darauf hingewiesen, dass Offb 11,7-13 im Hinblick auf den Tod und die Entehrung der zwei Zeugen v.a. — wenn nicht sogar ausschließlich — die Schuld und Verantwortung der Heiden betont (s.o. III). Dieser Schwerpunkt wird durch die Wahl der spezifisch römischen *damnatio memoriae* vom Autor der Apokalypse zusätzlich verstärkt. Er konnte damit rechnen, dass seine Leser/Hörer als Bewohner Kleinasien⁽⁹⁴⁾ und somit des römischen Reiches mit den in Abschnitt II behandelten Spielarten der *damnatio memoriae*, d.h. Verlust des Grabrechts und Feier des Todes(tages), vertraut waren. Insofern konnte er davon ausgehen, dass sie die in Offb 11,9-10 vorausgesagten Maßnahmen auf dem Hintergrund der römischen

⁽⁹¹⁾ Ministero per i Beni e la Attività Culturali Soprintendenza special per i beni archeologici di Roma (ed.), *Forum Romanum/Palatin/Kolosseum*. Führer (Milano 2008) 9.

⁽⁹²⁾ Vgl. *Forum Romanum*, 12: “Gegenüber der *Curia* steht der *Lapis Niger*, ein Fußbodenabschnitt aus schwarzem Marmor, umgeben von einer Balustrade, angeblich die Stelle, an der Romulus ermordet wurde oder im Himmel verschwand oder das *Volcanale* (das Heiligtum Vulkans) stand.”

⁽⁹³⁾ ZIEGLER, “*Gemoniae scalae*”, 1115; Besucher Roms können sich davon überzeugen, dass die Straße, die Ziegler im Jahre 1910 erwähnte, noch heute unter diesem Namen existiert. Sie macht — vom Kapitol kommend — vor den (modernen) Treppen, die rechts am Mamertinus-Tullianum-Gefängnis entlang nach unten zum *Forum Romanum* führen, eine Linkskurve.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ BROER, *Einleitung*, 673.

damnatio memoriae verstehen und folgerichtig als von Heiden verantwortet auffassen würden.

3. Unter- und Überbietung der römischen *consecratio*

Sobald sich ein antiker Leser/Hörer der Johannesoffenbarung dessen bewusst war, dass die Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen in Offb 11,11-13 in Anlehnung an die römische *consecratio* geschildert worden sein könnte, werden ihm neben den Parallelen (s.o. II.2) unweigerlich auch die zwischen *consecratio* und Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen bestehenden Unterschiede aufgefallen sein.

Entsprechend kann die *consecratio* als historischer Hintergrund von Offb 11,11-13 auch modernen Exegeten die Augen für die ansonsten eher schwer auszumachenden Nuancen dieser Perikope öffnen. Es soll nun aufgezeigt werden, inwiefern die in Offb 11,11-13 berichtete Himmelfahrt die Vorstellung der römischen *consecratio*-Himmelfahrt sowohl unter- als auch überbietet.

Die römische *consecratio*-Vorstellung wird von der Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen gewissermaßen unterboten, indem aus Offb 11,11-13 deutlich hervorgeht, dass die zwei Zeugen — anders als die konsekrierten römischen Kaiser — nicht als Götter betrachtet werden. Die Perspektive von Offb 11 ist durchgängig monotheistisch. So wird sowohl vor als auch nach der Auferstehung bzw. Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen klar zwischen ihnen und Gott als dem (a) κύριος τῆς γῆς (Offb 11,4), (b) θεός (11,11) und (c) θεός τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (11,13) unterschieden.

Überboten wird die römische *consecratio*-Vorstellung von der Leibhaftigkeit der in Offb 11,11-13 vorausgesagten Auferstehung bzw. Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen. D.E. Aune hat richtig festgestellt, dass "the two witnesses are physically taken up alive into heaven"⁽⁹⁵⁾. Im Gegensatz dazu weist er auf jüdische und christliche Märtyrerlegenden hin: "There are some Jewish and Christian martyr legends in which it is reported that martyrs ascend to heaven after their deaths, where they stand before God, though in every text with the exception of one (*T. Job* 39.12-13; 40.3), it appears to be a matter of the ascension of the souls of the martyrs"⁽⁹⁶⁾.

Ein ähnlicher Gegensatz ist auch festzustellen, wenn man die in Offb 11,11-13 geschilderte Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen mit den

⁽⁹⁵⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 625.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ AUNE, *Revelation 6-16*, 625; kursive Hervorhebung im Original.

antiken Berichten über die Verbrennungen bzw. Himmelfahrten konsekrierter Kaiser vergleicht. So ist hier weder von einer leiblichen Auferstehung noch von einer leiblichen Himmelfahrt der Kaiser die Rede. Nach römischer Vorstellung stieg — neben bzw. mit dem Adler⁽⁹⁷⁾ — lediglich der Rauch⁽⁹⁸⁾, die Seele (Suet. *Caes.* 88: *anima*) oder das Abbild (Suet. *Aug.* 100.4: *effigies*) eines verbrannten konsekrierten Kaisers in den Himmel empor.

Insofern ist es naheliegend, dass der Autor der Johannesoffenbarung die Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen bewusst als Überbietung der römischen *consecratio* dargestellt hat, um so die Überlegenheit des θεός τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Offb 11,13) bzw. seiner Diener über das *Imperium Romanum* und die römischen Kaiser zu betonen.

Diese Überlegenheit kommt auch dadurch zum Ausdruck, dass die Zeugen, obwohl sie zunächst ermordet und geschändet wurden, schließlich dennoch siegreich auferstehen und zum Himmel aufsteigen. Dieser Triumph wäre nach römischer Vorstellung, in der sich *damnatio* und *consecratio* gegenseitig ausschlossen, undenkbar gewesen.

*
* *

Anhand von literarischen Quellen aus der Antike wurde im vorliegenden Artikel auf die enge Parallelität zwischen Offb 11,7-13 und der römischen *damnatio* bzw. *consecratio* hingewiesen. Im Gegensatz zu sowohl (a) den verstreuten jüdischen Parallelen als auch (b) den neutestamentlichen Texten über die Passion, Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu eignen sich diese beiden zusammen gehörenden römischen Maßnahmen als ein umfassender und kohärenter historischer Hintergrund für die in Offb 11,7-13 gemachten Voraussagen. Von daher wäre es gut denkbar, dass sich der Autor der Johannesoffenbarung bei der Beschreibung des demütigenden Todesschicksals (Offb 11,7-10) sowie der siegreichen Auferstehung/Himmelfahrt der zwei Zeugen (Offb 11,11-13) an dem Kontrast zwischen römischer *damnatio* und *consecratio* orientiert hat. Insofern sollten Ausleger die *damnatio* und *consecratio* als Erklärungsmodell für Offb 11,7-13 in Erwägung ziehen, wobei es durchaus möglich ist, dieses Erklärungsmodell nicht als

⁽⁹⁷⁾ Vgl. KLAUCK, *Umwelt II*, 48; siehe auch die Innenseite des Titusbogens in Rom sowie römische Münzen mit *consecratio*-Reversen.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Vgl. CLAUSS, *Kaiser und Gott*, 363 (mit Anm. 41).

Alternative, sondern als Ergänzung zu den jüdischen und/oder christlichen Parallelen zu Offb 11,7-13 aufzufassen.

Evangelische Theologische Fakultät
St. Jansbergsesteenweg 97
B-3001 Leuven

Boris A. PASCHKE

SUMMARY

With regard to the prophecy of the death, desecration, resurrection, and ascension of the two witnesses (Rev 11,7-13) most exegetes reckon with a Jewish background. However, the Jewish parallels they refer to stem from different works, contexts, and epochs. Some exegetes also consider the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus the background of Rev 11,7-13. However, the itinerary of Jesus (as presented in the New Testament) significantly differs from the events described in Rev 11,7-13. The present article suggests the Roman *damnatio* and *consecratio* as an alternative (or at least complementary) historical background for Rev 11,7-13. In contrast to both the Jewish and Christian traditions/sources, this background is both encompassing and coherent. Thus, the Roman *damnatio* and *consecratio* should be taken into account as an exegetical framework for Rev 11,7-13.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Elena DI PEDE, *Au-delà du refus: l'espoir. Recherches sur la cohérence narrative de Jr 32-45 (TM) (BZAW 357)*. Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2005. xvii-404 p. 16 × 23,5. €118

Dass sich die Forschung am Jeremiabuch derzeit in einer Hausse befindet, haben die kürzlich erschienenen mehrbändigen Kommentare von Jack Lundbom (2.207 Seiten) und Georg Fischer (1.508 Seiten) nachdrücklich unter Beweis gestellt. Doch trotz der Fülle exegetischer Arbeiten sind bei weitem nicht alle Probleme gelöst, die dieses Prophetenbuch, eines der schwierigsten und theologisch interessantesten Bücher des Alten Testaments, stellt. Selbst bei grundlegenden Fragen wie der nach der Entstehungsgeschichte oder nach dem Vorrang der hebräischen oder griechischen Textfassung ist derzeit kein Konsens absehbar.

Umso willkommener kommt deshalb die Studie von Elena di Pede über Jer 32–45. Wenn man von der schönen, aber wenig beachteten Arbeit von J.M. Abrego de Lacy (*Jeremías y el final del reino. Lectura sincrónica de Jer 36–45* [Estudios del Antiguo Testamento 3; Valencia 1983]) absieht, liegt damit zum ersten Mal eine umfangreiche narrative Analyse zum Jeremiabuch vor. Nachdem diese Methode ihre Fruchtbarkeit an den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments bereits unter Beweis gestellt hat, will sie nun auch bei den "hinteren Propheten" reüssieren. Di Pede hat sich nämlich vorgenommen, was den diachron arbeitenden Exegeten bislang nicht gelang: sie will die inhaltliche Kohärenz der Kapitel Jer 32–45 (MT) erweisen.

Die klar strukturierte, schrittweise sich entfaltende Studie umfasst in über 400 Seiten eine Einleitung, drei Hauptteile, eine Zusammenfassung und diverse Register (Abkürzungs- und Literaturverzeichnis, Indizes zu den zitierten Autoren und den Bibelstellen).

In der *Einführung* (1-13) umreißt die Autorin einige Probleme der bisherigen Forschung zu Jer 32–45, vor allem in Bezug auf deren verworrene Chronologie. Damit begründet sie ihre methodische Entscheidung, den Text nicht historisch-diachron, sondern literarisch-synchron anzugehen.

Im *ersten Hauptteil* "Délimitation du texte et hypothèse de lecture" (15-116) rechtfertigt sie die von ihr vorgenommene Abgrenzung des zu untersuchenden Textbereichs. Im Unterschied zu fast allen Exegeten betrachtet di Pede die Kapitel von Jer 32 bis Jer 45 nämlich als *einen* zusammenhängenden Erzählblock, der durch Jer 32 eröffnet wird. Gegen die übliche Auffassung, Jer 32–33 sei eine Fortsetzung des Trostbüchleins (Jer 30–31), verweist sie darauf, dass mit Jer 31,40 ein klarer Abschluss und mit Jer 32,1 ein ebenso klarer Neueinsatz gegeben seien und dass beide Textgruppen sich auch stilistisch deutlich unterscheiden.

Für sie bildet Jer 32 den Auftakt, die Ouvertüre der folgenden Erzählung. Hier, so ihre These, würden die räumlichen und zeitlichen Dimensionen abgesteckt, die wichtigsten Figuren vorgestellt und die zentralen Themen eingeführt. Hier werde der "contrat de lecture" geschlossen, der "Vertrag" zwischen Erzähler und Leser, in dem die nötigen Verstehenskategorien vermittelt werden: Der Leser solle 1. sich durch die scheinbare Inkohärenz des nachfolgend Erzählten nicht irritieren lassen, 2. die verheißene Wiederherstellung des Gottesvolkes stets im Blick behalten und 3. sich von der Figur des Propheten Jeremia an die Hand nehmen lassen.

Der *zweite Teil* "La temporalité en Jr 32–45 et la logique du récit" (117–197) widmet sich der schwierigen Frage nach der Chronologie dieser Kapitel. Zunächst werden die zeitlichen Sprünge innerhalb von Jer 32–45 präsentiert. Dabei bereiten vor allem jene Kapitel Schwierigkeiten, die ohne Überleitung aus der Zeit während der Belagerung Jerusalems in die Regierungszeit des Königs Jojakim zurückführen (Jer 35, 36 und 45). Ihrem methodischen Ansatz gemäß versteht di Pede diese Dechronologisierung der Erzählung nicht als einen zu behebenden Mangel, sondern als Hinweis auf eine zugrunde liegende narrative Strategie.

Um die Notwendigkeit eines neuen Zugangs zu unterstreichen, führt sie die Lösungsmodelle dreier "klassischer Kommentatoren" vor: C.H. Cornill, J. Steinmann und J. Bright. Die Autorin will zeigen, dass deren Versuche, die Ereignisse nach ihrer vermuteten chronologischen Abfolge neu zu ordnen, zu keinem befriedigenden Ergebnis führen. Damit erscheint der von ihr vertretene Methodenwechsel umso dringlicher. Denn wenn sich durch historische Forschungen keine Kohärenz erweisen lässt, muss sie durch eine narrative Analyse gewonnen werden.

Dass die Argumentation an diesem Punkt nicht recht überzeugt, liegt nicht nur an der Unübersichtlichkeit der sich über fünf Seiten erstreckenden Tabelle, die die unterschiedlichen Positionen der drei Autoren illustrieren soll (142–146). Vor allem irritiert, dass für die Gegenposition nur Studien ausgewählt wurden, die vor vierzig, fünfzig, ja hundert Jahren verfasst wurden. Warum werden keine neueren Arbeiten zur Geschichte Judas und zur Redaktion des Jeremiabuches herangezogen? Da die Chronologie eine so wichtige Rolle spielt, hätte man eine gründlichere Beschäftigung mit den schwierigen Datierungsfragen erwartet. Nach Auffassung maßgeblicher Historiker (z. B. des in der Bibliographie zitierten A. Malamat) dauerte die Belagerung Jerusalems nämlich nicht "maximal sechzehn Monate" (173), sondern ganze zweieinhalb Jahre (Januar 588 bis Juli 586).

Im letzten Kapitel des zweiten Hauptteils stellt di Pede den Zugang vor, mit dem sich nach ihrer Überzeugung die Aporien der traditionellen Exegese überwinden lassen: die synchrone Interpretation des Textes mit Hilfe einer narrativen Analyse.

Zunächst gibt sie einen kurzen Überblick über die Grundlagen dieser Methode (159–163). Ohne überflüssigen theoretischen Ballast erläutert sie die wichtigsten Kategorien (Erzählzeit und erzählte Zeit, Ellipse, Analepse und Prolepse) und weist damit die Richtung für einen ersten systematischen Durchgang, der die rhetorische Gestalt des Textes aufzeigen soll.

In Jer 32–39, dem ersten, "dechronologisierten" Teil der Erzählung entdeckt di Pede eine konzentrische Struktur (177–180). In deren Zentrum

stehen vier *flash backs*, die stufenweise bis in das Jahr 605 v. Chr. zurückführen und das Hören bzw. Nichthören auf das Wort Gottes thematisieren (Jer 34–37). Um sie herumgelegt sind die Erzählungen über die Belagerung und den Fall Jerusalems, in denen vor allem das Schicksal der Stadt und des Propheten auf dem Spiel steht (Jer 32–33; 38–39). Dabei verwendet der Erzähler zum einen Analepsen, um die Spannung zu steigern, und zum anderen Prolepsen, um die Lesererwartung zu steuern. Die chaotische Chronologie, die sich daraus ergibt, spiegele die tatsächliche Konfusion im belagerten Jerusalem wider.

Der zweite Teil der Erzählung (Jer 40–44[45]), dessen Chronologie weniger Probleme aufwirft, wird kürzer abgehandelt. Hier diskutiert die Autorin vor allem die Frage nach dem Ende der Erzählung bzw. nach dem chronologisch deplatzierten Schlusskapitel Jer 45. Da das darin enthaltene Orakel sowohl einen Rückblick auf das bereits ergangene Gericht (45,4) als auch die Verheißung einer heilvollen Zukunft (45,5) enthalte und zudem an Baruch, den Hauptzeugen der Worte Jeremias, gerichtet sei, sei es sehr gut als Abschluss der ganzen Erzählung geeignet.

Im *dritten Teil* “L’intrigue et les personnages du récit” (199–327), dem inhaltlichen Hauptteil der Studie, gibt die Autorin einen systematischen Überblick über die Fabel (*intrigue*) von Jer 32–45 und die darin vorkommenden Charaktere.

Es gelingt ihr, die vierzehn Kapitel als eine kohärente, klar strukturierte Erzählung zu beschreiben, deren Thema die mehrfache Ablehnung des Wortes Gottes sei. Die einzelnen Episoden seien so miteinander verknüpft, dass sich sowohl in Bezug auf die beschriebenen Ereignisse als auch auf den Inhalt eine logische Gesamthandlung ergebe. Die Struktur der Fabel, wie sie die Autorin dann im Einzelnen erläutert, entspricht genau dem narrativen Grundschema: Exposition – Komplikation – Lösung – Epilog.

In den ersten beiden Kapitel Jer 32–33, der Exposition, werden die drei Hauptthemen eingeführt, die im weiteren Verlauf entfaltet werden: das Nichthören auf das Wort Gottes, das Schicksal Jeremias und Jerusalems und die Ablehnung der verheißenen Wiederherstellung. Dadurch dass der Leser schon hier, zu Beginn der Erzählung, in die heilvollen Pläne Gottes eingeweiht wird, kann er den folgenden deprimierenden Bericht über die Katastrophe Judas besser einordnen.

Die eigentliche Erzählung (*complication*) entwickelt sich dann dementsprechend in drei Etappen: In Jer 34–36 werden durch einen Rückblick in die Vergangenheit die Ursachen des Unheils aufgedeckt: die Umkehrbotschaft Jeremias wurde schon seit langem in Juda abgelehnt. In Jer 37–39 wird das gegensätzliche Schicksal des Propheten und der jüdischen Hauptstadt geschildert: die Zerstörung Jerusalems war eine Strafe für den Ungehorsam der Judäer, dem Propheten aber brachte sie die Befreiung. In Jer 40–42 schließlich wird erzählt, wie auch der hoffnungsvolle Neuanfang nach der Katastrophe scheiterte.

Die Lösung (*dénouement*) der narrativen Spannung erfolgt in Jer 43,1–7, wo die Judäer Jeremias Rat ablehnen und die Entscheidung fällen, der Heimat endgültig den Rücken zu kehren.

Der Epilog (Jer 43,8–45,5) bekräftigt nur noch das Strafurteil über das rebellische Gottesvolk. In der Person Baruchs verweist er aber auch auf die

Möglichkeit der Rettung und lädt den Leser ein, selbst Stellung zu dem Erzählten zu beziehen.

Das zweite Kapitel des dritten Teils beschäftigt sich mit der zentralen Figur der Erzählung, dem Propheten Jeremia, und den anderen Charakteren, die auf die eine oder andere Weise auf ihn bezogen sind. Dem Gang der Erzählung folgend entwirft di Pede ein differenziertes, inhaltlich abgesichertes Porträt des Propheten. Sein Hauptmerkmal ist, dass er nicht aus eigener Initiative agiert, sondern auf Anfragen und Aufträge reagiert, die von Gott oder von anderen Menschen auf ihn zukommen. Die Erzählung unterstreicht seine Treue zum göttlichen Wort, lässt aber auch erkennen, dass er in der Umsetzung des ihm Aufgetragenen auch kreativ werden kann. Neben seiner tragenden Rolle innerhalb der Fabel ist Jeremia auch für den Leser wichtig. Er ist für ihn ein verlässlicher Führer durch das komplizierte Geschehen, indem er ihn über dessen Hintergründe informiert und sich ihm als Identifikationsfigur anbietet.

Besonders interessant sind di Pedes Ausführungen über die beiden Episoden, in denen Jeremia nicht vorkommt, Jer 36 und Jer 40,7–41,18 (291–327). Vor allem die zweite wurde in der Exegese meist als ein literar- und redaktionskritisches Problem behandelt. Aus narratologischer Sicht erhalten diese Teile der Erzählung eine ganz neue, wichtige Funktion. Sie zeigen nämlich, was geschieht, wenn der Prophet (und mit ihm auch Gott, wie di Pede betont) nicht „auf der Bühne“ ist bzw. wenn er nicht zu Rate gezogen wird: der König wird zum Diktator und das Volk zum Opfer gewissenloser Bandenchefs.

Vor allem in diesem dritten Teil der Studie kann die Autorin demonstrieren, wie gut die narrative Methode geeignet ist, um durch eine formale Analyse dem Inhalt und der Intention eines Textes nahe zu kommen. Immer wieder verweist sie auf die Rolle des Lesers und macht so deutlich, dass biblische Exegese nicht bei der wissenschaftlichen Textarbeit stehen bleiben darf, sondern auch den Sinn der Schrift für heutige Glaubende aufzeigen muss.

Allerdings macht sich hier auch die Beschränkung auf narrative Texte einerseits und auf Jer 32–45 andererseits bemerkbar. So hätten die Begegnungen zwischen Jeremia und König Zidkija in Jer 37–38 mit der in Jer 21,1–10 verglichen werden müssen. Dann wäre vielleicht aufgefallen, dass Jeremia in Jer 37,3–11 die Anfrage des Königs nicht einfach ignoriert (so 257). Er deutet sie vielmehr stillschweigend um: wo dieser darum gebeten hatte, bei Gott Fürbitte einzulegen (דַּחַפֵּל, v. 3), spricht Jeremia in seiner Antwort von der Bitte um einen göttlichen Bescheid (דַּרַּשׁ, v. 7). Statt also das von Zidkija geplante Unternehmen einfach abzusegnen (wahrscheinlich dachte dieser an einen militärischen Ausfall hinter den abziehenden Babyloniern her), proklamiert er die von Gott gewünschte Alternative: die freiwillige Kapitulation.

Ergänzungsbedürftig erscheinen auch die Aussagen über das Verhältnis zwischen dem Propheten und seinem Gott (277–280). Gott rede viel, Jeremia schweige meistens. Damit ist zwar die Weise des Erzählens definiert, nicht aber der Charakter Jeremias. Denn ein völlig anderes Bild ergäbe sich, wenn die Konfessionen herangezogen würden, die zumindest teilweise in diese Periode gehören dürften. Da sie aber weder narrative Texte noch innerhalb

von Jer 32–45 überliefert sind, konnten sie aus methodischen Gründen nicht berücksichtigt werden.

Zum Abschluss sollen en passant noch einige kleinere Mankos erwähnt werden: falscher Zeilenumbruch im hebräischen Text (27, n. 24; 28, 2. Absatz), Fehler in der Bestimmung von Verbformen (65: Die *qatal*-Form נָתַח in Jer 32,36 muss als Perfekt wiedergegeben werden; 185: Die Verben des Zerstörens הָרַס und נָתַח in Jer 45,4 stehen nicht in der Vergangenheit, sondern im Präsens), orthographische Fehler in den bibliographischen Angaben (369, 375, 379, 383 und 385: fehlerhafte Titelangaben bei W. Brueggemann, C. Hardmeier, H. Misch, L. Stulman und G. Wanke).

Sind letztere Ungenauigkeiten nur einem unaufmerksamen Lektor anzulasten? Oder sind sie ein Indiz, dass wichtigeren neuen (vor allem deutschsprachigen) Untersuchungen zu wenig Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt wurde? Natürlich hängt das mit dem anderen methodischen Ansatz zusammen. Die Autorin weist in ihren Schlussbemerkungen selbst auf die unterschiedlichen Fragestellungen der diachronen und synchronen Methoden hin (331–332). Doch heißt das, dass die Beobachtungen literarkritisch und redaktionsgeschichtlich ausgerichteter Untersuchungen für die narrative Analyse irrelevant sind?

Di Pedes Studie ist deshalb auch ein Beleg für die schwierige Kommunikation zwischen historisch-kritischer und literaturwissenschaftlicher Biblexegese. Wobei die unterschiedlichen Sprachen eine zusätzliche Barriere bilden. Das positive Gesamturteil soll dadurch aber nicht geschmälert werden. Erfreulich ist schon der Mut, mit dem die Autorin mit neuen Fragestellungen an alte Probleme herangeht. Der Jeremia, den sie präsentiert, ist eine lebendige und anregende Gestalt, sein Buch nicht mehr so undurchschaubar und schwierig, wie es oft erschien. Vor allem aber nimmt sie den Leser in die dramatische Geschichte zwischen göttlichem Heilsplan und menschlicher Widerspenstigkeit hinein und lädt ihn zur "Hoffnung jenseits der Verweigerung" ein.

Wir dürfen gespannt sein, welche neuen Einblicke uns Elena di Pede in ihrer angekündigten Arbeit über die griechische Version dieser Geschichte eröffnen wird.

Villa Cavalletti
Via XXIV Maggio, 73
I-00046 Grottaferrata (RM)

Michael P. MAIER

P.W.T. STOOP-VAN PARIDON, *The Song of Songs. A Philological Analysis of the Hebrew Book שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים* (Ancient Near Eastern Studies 17), Louvain – Paris – Dudley, MA, Peeters, 2005. xvi-539 p. 21 £ 30,5. € 90

This philological commentary is a revised version of a doctoral dissertation, completed under the supervision of T. Muraoka (Leiden, 2003). It opens with a short introduction, presenting a *status quaestionis* and an outline of the

study. Here I already meet a disturbing inconsistency: "I pose my questions, as often as is possible, independently of the results of any prior research on the SofS..." is followed a few lines further by "... collecting the lexical and grammatical information in the concordance of Lisowsky [whatever that may mean] → filling in the philological details from commentaries on the SofS from 1778 onwards..." (14). Chapter 2 offers a very extensive analysis (448 pages). Chapter 3 presents the conclusions on the significant results of this study, the literary composition of Cant, and topics for further research. There is an appendix on 1QGenAp XX,1-8, an extensive bibliography, and indices of cited passages and of authors. The analysis leads to some interesting conclusions, especially with respect to the literary composition: the author identifies the characters who declaim the texts, viz. the daughters of Jerusalem (chorus) (A), the female protagonist (B), her attendant (C), the beloved shepherd (D), B + D (E), the guards (F), Solomon (G), the brothers of the female protagonist (H). The dialogues develop as follows: (A) 1,2-4; (B) 1,5-7; (A) 1,8; (C) 1,9-12; (B) 1,13-14; (C) 1,15; (B) 1,16-2,1; (C) 2,2; (B) 2,3-10; (D) 2,11-14; (E) 2,15; (B) 2,16-3,5; (F) 3,6-11; (C) 4,1-5; (B) 4,6; (C) 4,7; (A) 4,8; (G) 4,9-15; (B) 4,16; (G) 5,1; (B) 5,2a; (D) 5,2b-3; (B) 5,4-8; (A) 5,9; (B) 5,10-16; (A) 6,1; (B) 6,2-3; (C) 6,4-8; (D) 6,9a; (C) 6,9b-12; (A) 7,1a; (C) 7,1b; (A) 7,2-6; (G) 7,7-10a; (B) 7,10b-8,4; (F) 8,5; (B) 8,6-7; (H) 8,8-9; (B) 8,10; (D) 8,11-13; (B) 8,14. This leads the author to the following conclusions:

The investigations that were conducted in Ch. 2 clear up practically all the problems encountered by commentators in the translation and interpretation of שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים. Philological and literary peculiarities, text and context, are all helpful in identifying the speakers and they make clear which passages are spoken by which characters. In particular the consistent and logical use of language is an essential characteristic. On the grounds of the results of this study it can be concluded that שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים is just one continuous story (...), for which probably only one author is responsible (476).

And she further explains that Cant "displays all the characteristics which apply to classical drama; i.e. drama in the sense of role play and not in the sense of a tragedy" (477). This suggestion has already been made by others (e.g. E. Huwiler, *Song of Songs* [New International Biblical Commentary 12; Peabody, MA 1999] 238). Some of these identifications of characters (for example the female protagonist and her beloved) are obvious and well known in exegetical literature. Others are less clear, e.g. Solomon, and the attendant of the girl in the context of the harem is an original and clever invention by Stoop-van Paridon, which deserves attention. But in view of the total absence of clear indications in the book, it is hard to prove the presence of this character as well as the harem context which is supposed to be the place of most of the action: there is no explicit mention of a harem.

I have, however, quite a number of qualms about the analysis in chapter 2. The author has a tendency to accept almost always the least probable meaning of a word or a syntagm as the correct one. Admittedly, the text of Cant is full of linguistic *crucis* which are still very debated, and some of which will perhaps never be solved. And it is understandable that commentators do their

utmost to clarify the meaning and poetic force of the text. But I have a feeling that in the present commentary the limits of the lexically and grammatically acceptable are more than once exceeded. The author accepts a lot of ‘hidden language’ in this book, and in a highly erotic text, there certainly must be some hidden or euphemistic language. But on this point this commentary exaggerates to the extreme. Thus, for example in the intermezzo on שֶׁמֶן as veiled language for male fruitfulness (30-37).

There is no good reason why in Cant 1,6 שֶׁמֶן should not mean “has tanned” (55-56), nor why in 1,8 בַּעֲקֵי should not mean “in the tracks of” (66-9). In the latter case the argumentation in favour of meaning “loves” is more than far-fetched. גִּדְּיָהָ (1,8) is not a dual (69); נָאוֹי (1,10) is not a niphāl of אָוָה (76). What is the meaning of “curves of silver” (נִקְדוֹת הַכֶּסֶף; 1,11) and why is that a preferred choice? (79) The author makes full use of “perfect of confidence”, e.g. נָתַן in 1,11 (83); הִבִּיאֵנִי (2,4); all the verbs in 5,1 (243), and almost all the other occurrences of suffix-conjugation. Such geographic names as עֵין גִּדִּי (1,14) are too easily rejected, and what is the meaning of “my goat” in the translation of this verse, “*In my ‘vineyard’, ‘source’ of (or for) my goat*”? (89; LXX: Εγγαδου). The translation of הִשְׁמָע (1,16) as “*Listen you there*” cannot be correct (94). Translating שֶׁמֶלִי תַחַת לְרֹאשִׁי (2,6) as “His left under, for my head” betrays a tendency to translate etymologically, without taking into account Hebrew idiom, for תַּחַת simply means “under”. It simply is a wrong translation (111). On pp. 112-115, there is a good deal of special pleading for rejecting an evidently correct translation of 2,7 and replacing it by a wrong one:

I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,
by the gazelles or the wild does:

do not arouse or awaken
love, until it so desires. (traditional translation)

I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,
By the gazelles or the hinds of the highland:
[.....] (an *apostrophe*)

If you kindle and if you arouse
The love, while it is longing! (author's translation)

Cant 2,10a is translated as follows: “*He begins to sing, my sweetheart, and he speaks to me*” (123). This is supported with a reference to B.K. Waltke – M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN 1990) § 30.5.1d, on *instantaneous perfective*. However, the use of such a perfect is known only in the 1st person, as all the examples show. Moreover, there is no reason to translate נִאֲמַר ... עֲנֵה by “sing ... and speak”, for in Biblical Hebrew this is a quite current phrase, meaning “he answered/spoke and said”. On p. 131, we read concerning 2,13b: “The קוֹמִי etc. which follows is a repetition of verse 2.10, with the exception of לָכֵי, of which לָךְ (*dativus ethicus*) is the *ketib* in 2.10”. This shows a misunderstanding of the *Ktiv-qre* phenomenon. In this verse the *Ktiv* is לָכֵי (*Ktiv* is purely consonantal) and the *Qre* is לָךְ. There is no good reason why in 2,17 תִּסְוּ “(the shadows) flee” should be replaced by נִמְוּ “grow longer” (140; cf. *Megilloth* [BHQ 18, Stuttgart 2004] 60*), nor why in 3,2 רְחֹבוֹת should mean “courtyards” and not squares (148). The interpretation of אֵם בֵּית as “female genitals” is certainly not plausible in Cant 3,4, and even less in Gen 24,28 and Ruth 1,8 (150-154). On p. 163-165, the current, and no doubt correct interpretation of חָרַב אֶחָדִי הָרֶב as “all handling the sword” (3,8) is rejected on the basis of speculative arguments, and the phrase is translated as “all ‘seized by the knife’”, hidden language for “eunuchs”. All this is only a small part of the hundreds of

objections. I cannot list them all, but let me give the reader one example of a longer piece of text, viz. Cant 4,1-5, which exegetes often compare with an Arabic *wasf* (RSV and Stoop; 210-211):

RSV

1 Behold, you are beautiful, my love,
 behold, you are beautiful!
 Your eyes are doves behind your veil
 Your hair is like a flock of goats
 moving down the slopes of Gilead.
 2 Your teeth are like a flock of shorn ewes
 that have come up from the washing
 all of which bear twins
 and not one among them is bereaved
 3 Your lips are like a scarlet thread
 and your mouth is lovely.
 Your cheeks are like halves of a pomegranate
 Behind your veil.
 4 Your neck is like the tower of David,
 built for an arsenal (')
 whereon hang a thousand bucklers,
 all of them shields of warriors.
 5 Your two breasts are like two fawns,
 twins of a gazelle, that feed among the lilies.

Stoop-van Paridon

Look you here: beautiful, my friend,
 look you here, beautiful!
 Your 'springs': doves, behind your 'lock of hair';
 Your 'hair' like a pile of goat's hair,
 Which overflows from a 'mountain: always joy'.
 Both your 'rows of teeth' as a group of evenly formed ones,
 Which come out of the washing,
 Which are all double,
 And an imperfect one: that is none of them.
 Like a scarlet-red thread are your 'lips',
 And your 'mouth': charming.
 Like the split of a pomegranate your 'tender' (*part*)
 Behind your 'lock of hair'.
 Like a 'refuge' for a beloved one your 'neck'
 Built for 'dew' of 'mouths',
 A thousand 'givers' devoted to it,
 All 'arrows', or 'quivers', of strong men.
 Both your breasts like two roe calves,
 Twins of a gazelle, which graze in the shoshanim.

Let me just make one remark on a detail: in vs. 1, עֵינֶיךָ is interpreted as "your 'springs'", i.e. the female sex organ. But why then is the number dual? And if it is plural, עֵינֶיךָ should be the form (175-176). But on the whole, even if one can discuss some decision taken by the RSV, it offers a fair rendering of a not so difficult text, but in the alternative translation, all the nouns between inverted commas have a hidden sense referring to the female sexual organs. The obvious meaning and descriptive sequence of these verses gets lost, and that on the basis of a far-fetched and more than once wrong argumentation (175-206).

We can conclude that this monograph contains a thorough and brave analysis of Cant, showing some interesting approaches of the literary structure and offering quite a few stimulating suggestions for the exegesis, particularly concerning the use of hidden language. But in the detailed linguistic analysis it is often more reckless than brave. The reader is continually challenged to a very attentive and tough critical reading by the many questionable and wrong explanations. And, finally, in the present reviewer's opinion, an obstinate sticking to the MT is not an exegetical virtue.

Oudebaan, 4, box 4
 B-3360 Korbeek-Lo (Bierbeek)

Antoon SCHOORS

Gerlinde BAUMANN, *Gottes Gewalt im Wandel. Traditionsgeschichtliche und intertextuelle Studien zu Nahum 1,2-8* (WMANT 106). Neukirchener Verlag, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2005. x-285 p. 23 × 15 cm. € 39,90.

G. Baumann's exhaustive study of the introductory poem in Nah 1,2-8 is a revised version of her Habilitationsschrift, done under the supervision of Rainer Kessler and Jörg Jeremias, and accepted by the Protestant Faculty of Theology of the Philipps-University Marburg in the summer semester of 2004. The study addresses the theological issue of Nahum's portrayal of Yahweh's sometimes violent exercise of power in an attempt to legitimate that use against charges that it is arbitrary, unjust, and a mere reflection of nationalistic chauvinism.

She approaches this task by way of an intertextual approach closely tied to a history of traditions outlook. After a long introduction explaining her method, Baumann turns to a detailed treatment of Nah 1,2-8. This includes her translation and textual notes, but the heart of her work is tracing words and phrases in the psalm that suggest a citation or allusion to other, presumably older texts, or whose appearance in other texts, particularly in texts of the minor Prophets, regardless of the relative date of these texts, in some way echoes or modifies the sense of the passage in Nahum. So, for instance, she is troubled by the partial citation of Ex 34,6f in Nah 1,2-3, because it leaves out the confession of God's merciful side. By finding intertextual connections to such passages as Micah 7,18-20, she argues that the explicit lack in Nahum is somehow implicitly supplied intertextually. The three-fold repetition of נָקַם in v. 2 places God's actions on the plane of a justified response to the wrong-doing of his enemy, and the embedment of Nahum in the Book of the Twelve helps one see that the Nahum psalm does not limit the enemies of Yahweh to the Assyrians or even to enemies of Israel in general; any people or power could be the enemy of Yahweh. Thus God's violent actions against Nineveh are not arbitrary, unbridled revenge; they are a regular and legitimate expression of Yahweh's worldwide judicial response to oppressors. The catchword connections between the Nahum psalm and Habakkuk suggest a limitation on the "uncritical nationalism" sometimes attributed to Nahum. Moreover, the connections with Habakkuk, supplementing those with Micah, also suggest that the more positive side of the ancient formula of grace found in Ex 34,6f is present in Nahum. Yahweh's acts of violence toward his enemies are in the service of divine mercy toward those who had been oppressed by those enemies.

One may agree with her main theological conclusions, as this writer does, but it is not so obvious that the only way to reach these conclusions is through her approach. Throughout the work it is clear that Baumann's major discussion partners are scholars working on the redactional history of the Book of the Twelve. Toward the end of the book she offers a helpful critical assessment of the competing views of J. D. Nogalski, Burkard M. Zapff, Aaron Scharf, and Rainer Kessler. Though these scholars differ considerably on the details, nonetheless they share a common presupposition that a redactional study of the Book of the Twelve as a whole is important for an

understanding of each individual book within the collection. For those of us who do not share that presupposition, it is a little difficult to enter into the discussion. Baumann legitimately criticizes Nogalski for endowing very common terms with too much importance as “catchwords”, but when she finds an intertextual link between two books based on the appearance of עבר in both, though not only is the meaning different in each book, the root of the two words are not even the same, then one has to question whether her methodology is any better than those she criticizes.

Being an outsider to the discussion may limit the cogency of one's comments about this debate, but no such limitations exist for issues of the textual criticism, poetic analysis, and translation of the Hebrew text of Nah 1,2-8. Despite a long discussion, Baumann's treatment of text critical problems is superficial, largely concerned to preserve the MT and its line divisions. Her analysis of the line divisions is quite problematic, sometimes sustained only by equally problematic ad hoc translations. The best example of all three of these weaknesses is her treatment of the opening expression of v. 8, *bštp 'br*. In her text critical comment she states, “MT ist gut verständlich; eine textkritische Änderung (vgl. BHS) ist deshalb nicht notwendig [MT is easily understood; a textcritical change (cf. BHS) is therefore not necessary]” (154, n. 408). She then translates the phrase as a nominal clause making God the subject of the participle, “Der ‘Durchscreiter’ ist er der reissenden Flut [The one who crosses through is he in the rending flood]” (154). This translation allows her to treat the phrase as a complete line. She goes on, however, to discuss the closest parallels to this expression in the OT, all of which take the verb עבר “to pass over” as expressing the action of the noun שטח “flood” (Isa 8,8; 28,15.18; Dan 11,10.40; Ps 124,4-5). These parallels suggest that the participle in Nah 1,8 should be taken as a verbal adjective modifying the preceding noun, requiring a translation such as “in/with an overflowing flood...”, a translation supported by most ancient and modern versions. Indeed Baumann admits that her translation is without parallel, “Nah 1,8 bedient sich einer ansonsten nicht unbekannten Wortverbindung...in einer allerdings ungewöhnlicher Form... [Nah 1,8 makes use of an otherwise not unknown combination of words...in a certainly unusual form...]” (178). I seriously doubt whether many Hebraists will accept her ad hoc translation. However, if one adopts the more standard translation, “In an overflowing flood...”, the phrase in question is not a complete sentence and will require a predicate to complete the thought. That is not surprising, since the expression is suspiciously short for a complete line. That means, however, that one must either attach the phrase to the preceding line, the following line, or assume that something has dropped out of the text. The necessity of any of these moves suggests that the present MT is more disturbed than Baumann is willing to admit, and once that is recognized, Baumann's rejection of the widely held view that Nah 1,2-8 contains a partial acrostic loses much of its surface plausibility. Restoring such an acrostic does involve some significant text critical moves, but the state of the MT, if it is not redeemed by ad hoc translations, suggests that significant text critical moves are justified.

Despite my serious reservations on these points, there is much in Baumann's work to be admired. This is one of the most detailed studies of every word and phrase in the Nahum psalm that one is likely to ever

encounter. That can be both good and bad. For the superficial reader the work comes perilously close to offering more information about the psalm than one ever wanted to know. On the other hand, a close reading of the work will certainly reward the careful reader with many new and helpful insights, and these insights are available even if one does not always agree with Baumann's conclusions. One of the most striking of her insights, at least to this reader, was her observation that the first part of the psalm points to the Exodus tradition, the second to the prophetic material, and the third to the Psalms, leading her to comment, "Auf diese Weise entwirft der Nahum-Psalm ein in sich vollständiges Bild von JHWH als eines in seiner Vergeltung mächtigen und zornigen Gottes mit universaler Zuständigkeit [In this way the Nahum psalm projects a portrait of Yahweh complete in itself as a powerful and angry God with universal jurisdiction in his exercise of vengeance]" (187).

6112 Harrogate Dr.
Austin, TX 78759

J.J.M. ROBERTS

Novum Testamentum

Enrique MENA SALAS, "*También a los griegos*" (*Hch 11,20*). Factores del inicio de la misión a los gentiles en Antioquía de Siria (Plenitudo Temporis 9). Salamanca, Publicaciones de la Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2007. 432 p. 17 × 24.

The subtitle of this book reveals its concern and direction: "factores del inicio de la misión a los Gentiles en Antioquía de Siria". In accord with this subtitle the book is divided into three parts. Part One is concerned with the history of the scholarly investigation of this mission to Antioch; a literary-historical analysis of Acts 11,19-26. Part Two concentrates on "Gentiles and Jews in Antioch", with particular attention to the Feast of Tents. Part Three, by far the longest section of the book, treats of the Christian missionaries of Antioch, and the socio-religious identity and prophetic consciousness and Christological ideas in the Antioch community and in the missionaries to and from there.

In the first part of his book, S. attempts to identify ("... con un grado de historicidad aceptable", 27), the historical elements that are the basis of Acts 11,19-20; or, put another way, S. will offer "unas aclaraciones previas sobre la redacción lucana, para acceder, posteriormente, a los posibles datos históricos" (28). He begins this part of his study with a brief history of opinions about the historicity to be ascribed to Acts 11,19-20. He begins with A. Harnack and the Tübingen School. Harnack was one of the earliest

proponents of the “fuente antioquena”, a source which is made up of Acts 6,1–8,4; 11,19–30; 12,25–15,35 and which originated with Stephen, Barnabas and that Jewish-Christian community. Harnack claimed that this “fuente tendría gran valor histórico” (37). S. finishes his review of authors so as to include the important work of Hengel-Schwemer (1997). His conclusion from this review is that from the literary point of view, the investigation has been able to identify, with some assurance, elements and notices of tradition which offer trustworthy historical data. On the other hand, on the level of historical criticism, it is not possible to limit the study just to the text of Acts 11,19–26 (51); rather it is necessary to compare these verses of Acts with the sources that are available to us, beginning with notices that are contemporary with the Acts period so that, with even Patristic study included, we may establish with a surer degree of certitude the origins of the community in Syrian Antioch.

At the start of the book, one instinctively suspects witnesses about the Acts period which for centuries precede or follow Luke’s work and its own sources; but S. judiciously uses these sources so that he draws from them the most helpful insights into the world which made up the Antiochean church in its early years. Always S. keeps himself and his reader aware of the rather limited documentary and archeological materials at our disposal. S. shows his concern for methodology by which to study the relationship between preachers of the word to Antioch and the recipients of that word: “Este método sociocultural debe dar acceso y exigir una comprensión ideológica o teológica” (30), or, expressed in another way, “El método consiste, por tanto, en intentar justificar el *hecho* de la misión a los gentiles con las posibles ideas subyacentes tanto a los oyentes como a los evangelizadores” (31). Having described what is known about the community of Antioch and its environs, S. concludes: “Es muy probable que el movimiento cristiano llegara a Antioquía en medio de este ambiente” (82).

Once one passes the discussion regarding the historicity, or historical elements, in Acts 19–20, one embarks on a reconstruction of the thinking and hope that helped the missionaries who successfully preached in front of Antiocheans, and helped prepare Antiocheans for a positive reception of the preaching of Christianity as understood by the missionaries. S. has set for himself an ambitious undertaking in his last 250 or so pages, an undertaking which is painstaking, very logical in its conclusions and yields an enormous amount of ‘possibilities and probabilities’. Clearly S. has thought through the many sources at his command (footnotes run to 1052), and integrated them with Acts in an impressive way so as to ground, as best as possible, an appreciation of the culture represented by Acts 11,19–20. S. sets himself an early task, to give substance, from sources, to the conviction that the various types of people who made up the major Mediterranean cities and suburbs, each after his own manner, sought to overcome ‘displacedness’ through philosophy, religion, psychology or some immediate experience of God which would bring salvation in the present world. S.’s work is one of creating a tapestry of thought underlying the mission to those in Antioch mentioned in Acts 11,20. In doing so, he studies a variety of topics, ranging from the theology of Stephen regarding the fact that “the Most High does not live in things made by human hands” and the Presence of God signified in the meaning of the Feast of Tents, to the socio-religious status of the seven

prophets and doctors in Antioch (13,1), who S. considers a major part of a leadership in Antioch, to a theory of the beginnings of seeing Jesus' death as expiatory, to a perceived Gentile desire for immediate contact with God and salvation. With an economy of explanation, S. chooses what he thinks most probable in a variety of matters, discussed at length elsewhere in scholarship, all of which touch in some way upon what forged the compatible marriage between preachers and Antiocheans.

S. works to show how Jewish religionists had to adjust their own thinking in the Diaspora, which adjustment only furthered their hope of success with Gentiles. These three stages are crucial for S. theory: Palestinian Judaism had to be reinterpreted by Jewish Hellenists (particularly by those living far from the Holy Land and Temple of their ancestors), and then Jewish Hellenism had to take on an acceptable meaning for Gentiles who could find in this preaching a fulfilment of their longings for a fruitful relationship with God. To accomplish this, Temple worship had to be reinterpreted (S. repeats Stephen's statement that God does not live in things made by human hands) and the immediate, direct experience of God should be stressed (which of course involved Monotheism, a God responsible for both creation and salvation), and one's marginalization in society, whether sociological or theological, is removed by one's pertaining to a universal body in which God, through His Holy Spirit, dwells. Obviously, S. must integrate into this formula a meaning of Jesus of Nazareth which would be intelligible and acceptable to Gentiles, and so one moves through Jewish Palestinian belief about him to a glorification of Jesus which can both fit with respect for him as final Judge of the world and coincide with a reading of the Old Testament passages which spoke of an expected ruler who would bring salvation.

Because of the vastness of his theme, S. can devote only a brief time to extensive reflection on every one of his many themes; his plan is to make evident his choice among suggestions made by scholars on any one subject, and offers his reasons for his own preference among them — always building upon earlier themes to progress to a clearer picture of the world ready for the Christian message, and as well a clearer picture of the kind of theology which preachers themselves had developed for themselves out of Palestinian Judaism.

One cannot argue with the success of the author of this book. But, since he opened he door to a vast number of considerations regarding the move from Palestine to the Greek world, there are topics that could be mentioned as meriting some treatment. I would suggest the figure of Apollos, who is a concrete person, prominently, if briefly mentioned in Acts, who certainly reflects the culture of the Jewish Hellenist and perhaps represents the theology that had developed in Egypt which accounts for his successful preaching and success in Ephesus and Corinth. Perhaps too a rather thorough explanation of why Jesus' death as expiation could not have come from the Palestinian Jewish community. And with Jesus there always arises the question of divinity — perhaps a more acceptable thought in non-Palestinian culture, but certainly a rogue idea if Palestinian Christians had not already realized this identity of Jesus. A third request would be a treatment, even if only brief, about the changes in Palestinian Jewish Christian understanding of the Law of Moses and its traditions when this material was preached to the

Gentiles of Antioch. Already one respects the fact that Jesus differed in his interpretation of Moses and the associated traditions; is there anything to differ with Jesus' Palestinian understanding of the will of God that would find a home, if not a beginning in the world of Syrian Antioch? Finally, some word would be in place to describe the mysterious relationship between Jew and Gentile; no one shed all vestiges of Judaism when preaching Christ; while Paul called the union of Christ with his believers a mystery, there still seems to be room for some understanding of the insistent tactic: to the Jew first, then to the Greek. Indeed, Acts itself, while it means to document the movement of the plan of God to include Gentiles in the belief in Jesus, never forgets the primacy of Israel and at times seems to long for the old theology, though now dressed in a new, mysterious form, that the Gentiles are to come to the God of Israel; monotheism to be sure, but it is only the God of Israel who is God. Yahweh becomes the one, universal, real God, but he remains explained to a great degree through knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures.

This book has ample indices (texts, biblical and otherwise) and a very full bibliography. Very rarely are there errors in the text, but one can note such mistakes as no footnote 460, change of type font in entire p. 188 without cause, spelling such as Sanhnedrin (note 873), Hoffnurf (note 586), indexed reference to Acts 18,27, with no corresponding reference to that verse supposedly on p. 66.

One of the most attractive qualities of this book is the author's clarity of expression and fine logic, as he moves his reader through an orderly arrangement of topics to arrive at what turns out to be a quite reasonable explanation of the Antioch community and how it was ready, in some measure, for the preaching of Christ in its midst.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I-00187 Roma

John J. KILGALLEN, S.J.

Philip H. TOWNER, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006. xlviii-886 p. 16 × 24. \$52.00 - £29.99

Les presque mille pages du commentaire de Philip Towner couronnent plus de vingt ans de recherches et d'études sur les épîtres pastorales (EP). Outre ses nombreux articles, on rappellera, entre autres, sa thèse doctorale publiée sous le titre de *The Goal of Our Instruction. The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles* (JSNTSS 34; Sheffield 1989) et sa contribution à l'élaboration du commentaire de I. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1999).

A la suite notamment des récents travaux de L.T. Johnson, entre autres, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AB35A; New York 2001) et *Letters to Paul's Delegates. 1Timothy, 2Timothy, Titus* (Valley Forge, Pe 1996), qui

a vigoureusement remis en cause le consensus majoritaire sur la pseudépigraphie des EP, Towner conclut à leur authenticité paulinienne. Il reprend le débat sur le procédé d'écriture de Paul, sur l'histoire de la réception des EP au 2^{ème} siècle qui rend difficile l'hypothèse pseudépigraphique. Il critique l'utilisation des différences d'avec les autres lettres de Paul comme arguments contre l'authenticité. Quant aux disjonctions historiques entre, d'une part, les données des Ac et celles des autres lettres de Paul, et, de l'autre, celles des EP, elles pourraient s'expliquer par la non exhaustivité des informations contenues dans ces écrits. De même, les différences de style et de langage pourraient provenir des différences de situation.

En fin de compte, même si la discussion est pertinente et certainement utile à renouveler le débat, les contrarguments avancés sont davantage des critiques aux arguments en faveur de la pseudépigraphie que de véritables alternatives. D'ailleurs Towner lui-même, même si il opte pour l'authenticité paulinienne, pense que la question de l'auteur demeure une question ouverte (88).

Non sans lien avec la question de l'auteur, Towner souligne le fait que, différemment des autres lettres du corpus, les pastorales sont des lettres adressées à des collaborateurs de l'apôtre et non à des communautés. Leur regroupement sous le titre d'«épîtres pastorales», qui leur est attribué au début du XVIII^{ème} siècle, induit à tort, selon Towner, à une lecture de chacune des lettres comme la partie d'un tout, ce qui contribue à les isoler du reste du corpus paulinien et devient un argument en faveur de leur pseudépigraphie. Suivant en cela Johnson, Towner propose et défend une lecture qui respecte l'individualité de chaque lettre selon sa propre situation communicative. Ainsi, outre la distinction des adversaires ou des tâches ecclésiastiques propres à chaque lettre, Towner s'attachera à identifier, en les distinguant, les contextes religieux et culturels, politiques et ecclésiastiques respectivement d'Ephèse (1 et 2 Tm) et de Crète (Tt).

Cette insistance sur la spécificité de chacune des trois lettres n'empêche pourtant pas de reconnaître les relations particulières qu'elles entretiennent entre elles. Entre autres, leur particularité partagée d'être des lettres à des collaborateurs ou leur utilisation de traditions éthiques ou sotériologiques souvent proches. Il s'agira donc de tenir en compte la diversité et l'unité de ces lettres. D'ailleurs, les quatre-vingt-dix pages d'introduction générale, qui ouvrent le volume, présentent les trois lettres ensemble selon des thèmes habituels à une introduction (réception et canonicité, texte et traduction, les débats sur l'auteur, les perspectives herméneutiques, des considérations historiques et théologiques, etc.). De même, les six *excursus*, distribués dans la première partie du commentaire dédiée à 1Tm, traitent des motifs transversaux aux trois lettres, la "conscience" (117ss), la formule "Elle est digne de confiance, cette parole" (143ss), la "piété" (*eusebeia*, 171ss), la "modération" (206ss), "les bonnes actions" (210ss), "la manifestation" (*epiphaneia*, 416ss).

Prenant le contre-pied de la thèse traditionnelle de l'adaptation de la théologie des EP à une situation d'installation des communautés chrétiennes dans la société (aplatissement, "embourgeoisement", cf. Dibelius), Towner montre comment les emprunts aux motifs et au langage du monde gréco-romain (*Epiphanie*, *Sauveur*, la vie chrétienne comme *eusebeia* - piété, etc.)

résultent certes d'un effort d'inculturation et de contextualisation du message, mais sont également au service d'une théologie missionnaire aux dimensions universelles, qui, à sa manière, conteste l'idéologie impériale.

Même si les trois lettres utilisent les mêmes motifs (Sauveur, Epiphanie, etc.), Towner met en évidence des perspectives théologiques et des «trajectoires christologiques» spécifiques et propres à chacune d'entre elles.

En 1 Tm, l'«économie de Dieu» (*oikonomia theou* 1,4) suppose, contre les adversaires qui refusent cette réalité ordonnée par Dieu, une continuité positive entre nature et société (voir entre autres 1 Tm 4,1-5). Dans cette perspective s'inscrit la métaphore de l'église comme maison bien ordonnée (*oikos theou*) où chacun tient sa place. Quant à la dimension missionnaire universelle, explicite en 2,1-7; 3,16; 6,13, elle est inaugurée par la conversion de Paul rappelée en 1,12-16, qui devient modèle pour tout païen qui se convertit. Dans ce contexte théologique, où seul Dieu est désigné comme Sauveur (trois fois) et l'épiphanie n'intervient qu'une seule fois, référée à la parousie en 6,13s, Paul développerait une christologie centrée sur l'humanité de Jésus dans sa faiblesse 6,13-14.

En 2 Tm, en revanche, où seul Christ est Sauveur (2 Tm 1,10), où l'épiphanie est révélation dans le passé et dans le futur, la fonction eschatologique du Christ Seigneur est de mettre en évidence la résurrection et le rétablissement comme encouragement pour la mission. Ni les souffrances ni la mort ne sont des obstacles déterminants pour l'évangile de l'apôtre. Comme l'apôtre, son destinataire saura résister et ne pas avoir honte de l'évangile.

Mais c'est pour l'épître à Tite que Towner innove le plus. Le titre de Sauveur s'y applique et à Dieu et à Christ (1,3.4; 2,10.13; 3,4.6), le motif de l'Epiphanie désigne la révélation passée et future, Christ est le collaborateur du salut. L'accent n'est pas ici sur son humanité, mais, au contraire, il est proche de la divinité. Sauveur dans son apparition divine passée et gloire de notre grand Dieu. Et Sauveur également dans son apparition future, la représentation du Christ subvertit la pensée religieuse crétoise et conteste sa représentation de Zeus. Le message de la lettre à Tite s'inscrirait ainsi comme critique de la religion et de la mythologie véhiculées par les Crétois. La présentation d'entrée de jeu de la vie promise par le "Dieu qui ne ment pas" (Tt 1,2) donne le ton de cette critique de la religion des Crétois "menteurs" (Tt 1,12), où Zeus est présenté comme roi élevé au ciel et déifié, représenté comme jeune homme impulsif.

La discussion exégétique est détaillée et approfondie, on pourrait dire exhaustive, sur le plan philologique, syntaxique et grammatical, historique et social, culturel et religieux, théologique. Elle permet aussi le débat.

Ainsi, la discussion et l'interprétation proposée par Towner de l'ignorance et de l'incroyance invoquées par Paul pour expliquer son comportement d'avant la conversion (1 Tm 1,13, cf. 140-143), qui le situerait, selon la Tora, dans la catégorie des péchés commis inconsciemment ou sans l'intention de les commettre, ne m'a pas convaincu. Dans ce cas, le débat aurait mérité une discussion plus serrée avec les positions de Collins ou de Brox, d'ailleurs signalées en note (141, n. 32), mais non discutées.

Ou encore, dans le même contexte (148-151), à propos de 1 Tm 1,16 l'expérience de la conversion de Paul comme modèle de foi en Jésus comme

Messie qui sauve le pécheur en dehors des exigences rituelles et morales juives. Towner de préciser que si ce dernier aspect n'est certainement pas explicite dans ce verset, il est au coeur de l'évangile de Paul et s'inscrit donc dans le contexte de ce verset. Est-ce que malgré la volonté de mettre en évidence la spécificité de chaque lettre, on ne risque pas ainsi d'insérer "la pensée paulinienne", prise ailleurs, justement là où "elle n'est pas explicite"? Est-ce que l'harmonisation n'est pas trop rapide?

Cela dit, le commentaire de Towner fait preuve d'une connaissance approfondie et très étendue de la littérature significative sur les EP. Vingt pages de bibliographie sélective et cinq indexes complètent le volume (indexe analytique, auteurs modernes, références bibliques, littérature antique extrabiblique, mots grecs les plus importants). Outre les indexes, et ce n'est pas son moindre mérite, Towner rend rapidement disponible une grande quantité d'informations utiles à l'exégèse par une bonne organisation du discours et un langage clair. Les aspects les plus techniques de la discussion sont le plus souvent mis en note. Exemplaire, entre autres, la synthèse du débat à propos de l'enseignement de adversaires concernant l'interdiction du mariage et de certaines nourritures (1 Tm 4, cf. 293-295).

L'auteur porte également une attention particulière à l'intertextualité avec l'Ancien Testament et la tradition juive. Par exemple à propos de la prière pour les autorités et les rois (1 Tm 3,2, cf. 168), sur le concept d'*eusebeia* (172s), à propos de la motivation de l'interdiction d'enseignement pour les femmes (1 Tm 2,11-15, cf. 224-234), etc.

En outre, l'honnêteté avec laquelle les diverses positions interprétatives sont restituées permet un usage fructueux de l'ouvrage même lorsqu'on ne partage pas les choix de l'auteur. A ce propos les remarques en conclusion de l'exégèse de 1 Tm 2,11-15 (236-239) sur l'application des textes relatifs à la place de la femme dans la communauté (ou de l'esclave) et à la dialectique interne à la tradition paulinienne à ce sujet (Ga 3,28) sont une bonne contribution à la discussion.

Il s'agit donc d'un commentaire de haute qualité, qui couvre amplement le champ des débats, rend compte des différentes positions exégétiques, propose des solutions que l'on peut discuter et, qui, valeur certainement appréciable, malgré sa dimension imposante, reste lisible.

Facoltà Valdese di Teologia
Via Pietro Cossa 42
00193 Roma

Yann REDALIÉ

Varia

Tamar LANDAU, *Out-Heroding Herod. Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod Narratives* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 63). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2006. viii-262 p. 16 × 24,5.

Tamar Landau's *Out-Heroding Herod* is a revised version of her 2003 University of Oxford doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of Professors Martin Goodman and Christopher Pelling. This engaging and thoroughly researched monograph focuses on Josephus' implementation of rhetorical techniques in his two narratives of Herod the Great's reign (*War* 1.204-673; *Antiquities* 14-17.199). Through an exhaustive examination of these accounts, Landau seeks to demonstrate that Josephus is a conscientious historian who is well versed in both Jewish and Greco-Roman historiography. According to Landau's assessment, Josephus is a creative author who frequently inserted himself into his narratives. His rhetoric, for Landau, reveals that the Herod narratives, despite Josephus' incorporation of earlier source material, should be viewed as original compositions.

Landau divides her study into four major sections. Her lengthy introduction outlines her methodology, comments on Greco-Roman historiography, and introduces the reader to the modern theory of narratology and Josephus' background. Chapter I, "Historiographies", explores the writings and techniques of Greco-Roman and Jewish historians. Chapters 2 and 3, respectively titled "Herod's Portrait in the *Jewish War*" and "Herod's Portrait in the *Jewish Antiquities*", offer a detailed analysis of Josephus' use of rhetoric. Landau's conclusion summarizes her previous chapters and proposes that Josephus is a very assertive and opinionated narrator whose life circumstances greatly influenced his accounts of Herod's reign. Appendix one examines modern scholarship on Josephus' historiography and the Herod narratives. Appendix two contains an outline of Josephus' Herod narratives. A third appendix lists places elsewhere in Josephus' *War* and *Antiquities* where he implements rhetorical tools similar to those he used in the Herod narratives.

Herod is among the most widely studied Jewish figures from antiquity, and the subject of influential biographies by such distinguished scholars as A. Schalit (*König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* [Berlin 1969]) and P. Richardson (*Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* [Columbia, SC 1996]). Landau's book departs from these and other studies of this king by focusing on narratology. Instead of seeking to uncover the historical figure of Herod the Great, Landau examines how Josephus has used rhetoric to fashion particular portraits of this Jewish monarch. Landau also explores the creative ways Josephus crafted his accounts of Herod's reign to comment upon events in his own day. In this respect, Landau's work represents the cutting edge of Josephus studies. In the past decades, scholars have increasingly become aware that Josephus' works are as much original literary compositions as they are historical narratives. Since the publication of Steve Mason's seminal work *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (Leiden 1991), Josephus experts have

increasingly shifted their focus from reconstructing Josephus' sources to identifying his tendencies, interests, agenda, and use of rhetoric. This shift is also reflected in the current and forthcoming volumes of the Brill Josephus Project (S. Mason, ed., *Flavius Josephus: Translations and Commentary* [Leiden 1999-present]), which likewise devote considerable attention to Josephus' rhetorical skills. Landau's monograph builds upon this current trend in Josephus studies to explore one of the most complex and compelling figures from antiquity. The result is an outstanding book that will stimulate much discussion regarding Josephus' use of rhetoric and the historical reliability of his narratives.

Landau's topic is appropriate for rhetorical analysis since Josephus devoted the majority of book 1 of his *War* and over three books out of twenty of his *Antiquities* to Herod. To explain Josephus' interest in Herod, Landau seeks to understand what the Herod narratives tell us about their subject and their author. Like all students of Josephus, Landau must delve into the problematic issue of sources. For over a century, scholars have debated the extent to which Josephus has incorporated earlier material verbatim to craft his Herod narratives. Landau's methodology is closer to R. Laqueur's (*Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus* [Giessen 1920]) understanding of Josephus rather than the approach of St. J. Thackeray (*Josephus, the man and the historian* [New York 1929]) as she, like the former, emphasizes Josephus' originality whereas the latter attributed much of the distinctive language and knowledge of Greco-Roman literature in the *War* and *Antiquities* to Josephus' dependence upon literary assistants. Like Laqueur, Landau believes that the differences within the Herod narratives reflect Josephus' changing sentiments regarding Jewish nationalism and the Herodian era. Throughout her study, Landau focuses on the craft of ancient historiography to reveal a Josephus who remains an active part of his narratives. To support her thesis, Landau provides numerous examples to show that the rhetorical structure and content of the Herod narratives are typical of the form, language, and themes found elsewhere in the *War* and *Antiquities*. Although Landau recognizes that Josephus used sources, this evidence is compelling testimony to support her thesis that the Herod narratives should be regarded as original rhetorical compositions of Josephus. Landau, moreover, suggests that Josephus considered Herod a compelling figure for detailed study because his deeds helped to explain the political situation of the Jews after 70 C.E. For this reason, the Herod narratives are an appropriate topic for understanding Josephus' use of rhetoric and his historiographical methods. They not only provide us with an insight into Josephus the man, but also his subject and the problems facing the Jews of Josephus' day as well.

Landau views Josephus as a creative writer who is indebted to the Greco-Roman historical tradition. Yet, she aptly notes that he does not refrain from criticizing the Greeks for their disregard of "historical truth" (*War* 1.16). This, along with the interjection of his own opinions, which at times make Josephus part of the narrative, is part of the Greco-Roman historiography known as "Tragic History". By often adopting this genre, Josephus allows for the incorporation of his own voice into his narrative. Through this rhetorical device, and the use of dramatic elements and pathos in abundance, Josephus frequently permits his own partiality to emerge to dictate his treatment of

persons and events. Yet, Landau notes that Josephus also incorporated much from the tradition of Jewish historiography, namely his interest in Judaism and Jewish history. This is especially true of his appeal to the enduring covenant between God and his people as a driving force in history. Josephus emerges from Landau's study as a unique historian who integrated elements from both Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions. He sought to portray Herod accurately, but often included his own emotions in his accounts.

Landau proposes that Josephus constructs two different portraits of Herod. In the *War*, he separates Herod's domestic and public life to emphasize the duality of fortune. Here, Josephus' narrative voice is strong and dominates the accounts. Herod is a robust leader with tragic qualities, who suffers an unexpected series of personal misfortunes that are compounded by his self-destructive streak. Yet, Landau suggests that Herod is perhaps not a tragic character *per se*, but a historical figure with a few characteristics of the tragic character. He fails to evoke either pity or fear primarily because Josephus refused to let his readers see the inner Herod. This representation of Herod as a man who was brought down by familial strife, and yet had a strong association with Rome, foreshadows the turbulent circumstances that befell Judea during Josephus' day when his people had forsaken their past friendship with Rome, and had allowed internal strife to destroy Judea.

In the *Antiquities*, Landau notes that we meet a Josephus twenty years after his *War*. Like Josephus, Herod too is older and wiser — a much more complex man. Herod's failings now dominate Josephus' narrative. The result is a thoroughly disagreeable character, who nevertheless fails to stir pity. Landau suggests that Josephus' audience likely felt anger and even disgust or revulsion at the Herod of the *Antiquities*. This is largely because Josephus portrays Herod as a man who is aware of his deeds and their dire consequences, but nevertheless fails to control his emotions or feel remorse. Despite Josephus' harsh criticism of Herod, Landau suggests that the *Antiquities*, like the *War*, fails to evoke pity or sympathy among its readers. Although Josephus occasionally gives his audience a glimpse into Herod's point of view, Josephus still dominates the narrative to the extent that his account is often as much about Josephus as it is about Herod.

Landau concludes her work by offering a possible reason for Josephus' great interest in Herod. In her assessment, we must recognize that Josephus was unaware of the modern differentiation between author and narrator. Landau's narratological reading of the Herod narratives reveals a writer who made editorial decisions that are clearly independent from his earlier sources. Josephus often interjected personal observations based on his own life circumstances into his books. His own life experiences, in his opinion, vouched for the quality and reliability of his works. As Herod was the last independent ruler of Judea, the end of his reign in many respects marked the beginning of the decline of the Judean state and its tragic end in Josephus' day. For Josephus, Herod's story was a necessary preface for understanding the Jewish War as well as the situation of Jewry in his day. As Landau's research indicates, Josephus' more lengthy account of Herod's reign in his *Antiquities* provides little new material about this king, but much information about how its author has changed and grown over time. Her rhetorical

analysis of the Herod narratives provides a model that other scholars will hopefully use to explore Josephus' accounts of the Hasmonean period and the Jewish Revolt. Landau's monograph suggests that a study of rhetoric is essential for understanding the complex relationship between Josephus' narratives and history. All scholars interested in Josephus, Jewish history, Classics, and New Testament background will profit from a close reading of Landau's book.

403 North Francis St.
Cedar Falls, Iowa, USA

Kenneth ATKINSON

Errata corrige

'Summarium' del fascicolo 3/2008, 'Recensiones', sezione 'Varia':

T. Pedrazzi: A.E. KILLEBREW, *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity* – 433-437
invece di:

A. Knauf: A.E. KILLEBREW, *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity* – 433-437.

Ci scusiamo con l'autrice della recensione e con i nostri lettori.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Tutti i libri o i fascicoli che vengono inviati alla Direzione appaiono in questo elenco. Il fatto che vi figurino non implica alcun giudizio su di essi. Recensioni più ampie dei libri verranno fatte secondo il parere del Redattore.

I libri inviati alla Direzione che non sono stati chiesti direttamente per recensione non si restituiscono in nessun caso, anche se non potranno essere recensiti. Tutti i libri insieme con gli estratti di articoli inviati alla Direzione vengono trasmessi all'Editore dell'*Elenchus of Biblica* e vi appariranno secondo il giudizio dell'Editore.

I libri vanno inviati alla "Direzione di *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Via della Pilotta, 25 – I-00187 Roma – Italia".

Aageson, James W., *Paul, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Early Church* (Library of Pauline Studies). Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2008. xv-235 p. 15 × 23. £12.99

Ahearne-Kroll, Stephen P., *The Psalms of Lament in Mark's Passion. Jesus' Davidic Suffering* (SNTSMS 142). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2007. xiv-239 p. 14 × 22. £50.00 – \$95.00

Alexander, Philip S. – **Kaestli**, Jean-Daniel (eds.), *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Le canon des Écritures dans les traditions juive et chrétienne* (Publications de l'institut romand des sciences bibliques 4). Prahins, Éditions du Zèbre, 2007. 253 p. 16,5 × 24. €25

Anderson, Paul N. – **Just**, Felix, S. J. – **Thatcher**, Tom (eds.), *John, Jesus, and History. Volume 1, Critical Appraisals of Critical Views* (Symposium Series 44). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. viii-346 p. 15 × 23. \$37.95

Anderson, Paul N., *The Fourth Gospel and the Quest for Jesus. Modern Foundations Reconsidered*. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xx-226 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £24.99

Avalos, Hector – **Melcher**, Sarah J. – **Schipper**, Jeremy (eds.), *This Abled Body. Rethinking Disabilities in Biblical Studies* (Semeia Studies 55). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. ix-244 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

Aymer, Margaret P., *First Pure, then Peaceable*. Frederick Douglass, Darkness and the Epistle of James (Library of New Testament Studies 379). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xiii-148 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

Bakhouché, Béatrice – **Le Moigne**, Philippe (éds.), «*Dieu parle la langue des hommes*». Études sur la transmission des textes religieux (1^{er} millénaire) (Histoire du texte biblique 8). Prahins, Éditions du Zèbre, 2007. 219 p. 16,5 × 24. €38

Barclay, John M. G. – **Gathercole**, Simon J. (eds.), *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2008. x-208 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £25.00

Bar-Efrat, Shimon, *Das Erste Buch Samuel*. Ein narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen

Testament 176). Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2007. 379 p. 16 × 24. €48 – SFr 83

Barton, John, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2007. x-206 p. 15 × 23. £13.99

Basta, Pasquale, *Abramo in Romani 4. L'analogia dell'agire divino nella ricerca esegetica di Paolo* (AnBib 168). Roma, Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2007. 316 p. 16,5 × 24. €25

Bauckham, Richard – Mosser, Carl (eds.), *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (The St. Andrews Conference on Scripture and Theology). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008. xxiv-404 p. 16 × 23,5. \$28.00 – £15.99

Bauckham, Richard, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple*. Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Academic, 2007. 313 p. 15 × 23. \$29.99

Benno, Jacob (interpreted by), *The First Book of the Bible: Genesis*. His Commentary Abridged, Edited and Translated by Ernest I. Jacob and Walter Jacob. Augmented Edition. Jersey City, KTAV Publishing House, 2007. xxii-358 p. 16 × 23,5. \$49.50

Berlin, Adele, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Revised and Expanded Edition (The Biblical Resource Series). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company – Dearborn, Michigan, Dove Booksellers, 2008. xxiv-200 p. 15 × 23. \$21.00 – £11.99

Bernabé, Carmen – Gil, Carlos (eds.), *Reimaginando los orígenes del cristianismo*. Relevancia social y eclesial de los estudios sobre Orígenes del cristianismo (αγορά 23). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2008. 559 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Bernat, David A. – Klawans, Jonathan (eds.), *Religion and Violence*. The Biblical Heritage (Recent Research in Biblical Studies 2). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007. xiv-157 p. 16 × 24

Bernhard, Andrew, *Other Early Christian Gospels*. A Critical Edition of the Surviving Greek Manuscripts. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xiv-158 p. 31 plates. 15,5 × 23,5. £30.00

Berquist, Jon L. – Camp, Claudia V. (eds.), *Constructions of Space I*. Theory, Geography, and Narrative (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 481). New York – London, T&T Clark, 2008. xii-161 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

Berquist, Jon L., *Approaching Jehud*. New Approaches to the Study of the Persian Period (Semeia Studies 50). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. ix-249 p. 15 × 23

Bird, Michael F., *Jesus and the Origins of the Gentile Mission* (Library of New Testament Studies 331). London – New York, T&T Clark, s.a. xi-212. 16 × 24. £75.00

Blischke, Mareike Verena, *Die Eschatologie in der Sapienza Salomonis* (FAT 26). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2007. xi-309 p. 15,5 × 23. €59

Boda, Mark J. – Falk, Daniel K. – Werline, Rodney A. (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God*. Volume 2, The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism (Early Judaism and Its Literature 22). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xv-281 p. 15 × 23. \$39.95

Boer, Roland (ed.), *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies* (Semeia Studies 63). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. viii-238 p. 15 × 23. \$25.95

Brower, Kent E. – **Johnson**, Andy (eds.), *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xxiv-385 p. 16 × 23,5. \$35.00 – £19.99

Brown, William P. (ed.), *Engaging Biblical Authority*. Perspectives on the Bible as Scripture. Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2007. xvi-158 p. 15 × 23. £10.99.

Burridge, Richard A., *Che cosa sono i vangeli?* Studi comparativo con la biografia greco-romana (Introduzione allo studio della Bibbia, Supplementi 37). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2008. 363 p. 15,5 × 23. €36,35

Burridge, Richard A., *Imitating Jesus*. An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007. xxi-419 p. 16 × 24. \$35.00 – £19.99

Calduch-Benages, Nuria, *Dammi, Signore, il tuo sguardo*. Riflessioni bibliche sulla vita consacrata. Roma, Editrice Rogate, 2008. 149 p. 13 × 20. €14

Calduch-Benages, Nuria, *Il profumo del Vangelo*. Gesù incontra le donne (La Parola e la sua ricchezza 11). Milano, Paoline, 2007. 150 p. 15 × 23. €14

Campbell, Walter Sanger, *The "We" Passages in the Acts of the Apostles*. The Narrator as Narrative Character (Studies in Biblical Literature 14). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xii-150 p. 15 × 23. \$19.95

Campbell, William S. – **Hawkins**, Peter S. – **Schildgen**, Brenda Deen (eds.), *Medieval Reading of Romans* (Romans Through History and Culture Series 6). New York – London, T&T Clark, 2007. (7)-241 p. 15 × 22. £25.00

Campbell, William S., *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London – New York, T&T Clark, 2008. xiv-203 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £24.99

Capes, David B. – **DeConick**, April D. – **Bond**, Helen K. (eds.), *Israel's God and Rebecca's Children*. Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal. Waco, Baylor University Press, 2007. xviii-(1)-480 p. 16 × 23,5. \$59.95 – £33.99

Capps, Donald, *Jesus the Village Psychiatrist*. Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2008. xxv-145. 15 × 23. £10.99

Carroll, Robert P., *Jeremiah*. Volumes 1 and 2. Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. ix-496 p., pp. 497-874. 15,5 × 23,5

Catto, Stephen K., *Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue*. A Critical Analysis of Current Research (New Testament Library 363). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. xxi-226 p. 16 × 24. ?70.00

Chilton, Bruce, *Abraham's Curse*. Child Sacrifice in the Legacies of the West. New York – London – Toronto, Doubleday, 2008. (8)-259 p. 16 × 24. \$24.95

Cho, Sukmin, *Jesus as Prophet in the Fourth Gospel* (New Testament Monographs 15). Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006. xx-361 p. 16 × 24

Clarke, Andrew D., *A Pauline Theology of Church Leadership* (Library of New Testament Studies 362). London – New York, T&T Clark, 2007. viii-212 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

Clifford, Richard J. (ed.), *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel* (Symposium Series 36). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007. xiii-116 p. 15 × 23. £10.99

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume I: א-ה. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1993. 475 p. 19,5 × 25. £130 – \$275 – €195

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume II: ו-י. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. 660 p. 19,5 × 25. £130 – \$275 – €195

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume III: י-ט. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996. 424 p. 19,5 × 25. £130 – \$275 – €195

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume IV: ט-ל. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. 642p. 19,5 × 25. £130 – \$275 – €195

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume V: ל-ש. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. 957 p. 19,5 × 25. £150 – \$320 – €225

Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Volume V: ש-צ. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2007. 999 p. 19,5 × 25. £150 – \$320 – €225

Clines, David J.A., *The Bible and the Modern World*. Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005. 116 p. 15,5 × 23,5

Cocco, Francesco, *Sulla cattedra di Mosè. La legittimazione del potere nell'Israele post-esilico* (Nm 11;16) (Collana Biblica). Presentazione di Jean-Louis Ska. Bologna, Centro Editoriale Dehoniano, 2007. 330 p. 15 × 21. €26

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

MICHELE SIMONE, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 31 gennaio 2009

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma